Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2008 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

http://www.archive.org/details/masterpiecesofel12haze

SAMUEL HOUSTON

MASTERPIECES OF ELOQUENCE

FAMOUS ORATIONS OF GREAT WORLD LEADERS FROM EARLY GREECE TO THE PRESENT TIME

EDITED BY

MAYO W. HAZELTINE, A.M.
HON. JOHN D. LONG
HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE
HON. ALBERT J. BEVERIDGE
HON. WILLIAM E. MASON
HON. JOHN C. SPOONER
ARCHBISHOP IRELAND

IN TWENTY-FIVE VOLUMES

VOLUME XII

NEW YORK
P. F. COLLIER & SON

LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
SANTA BARBARA

CONTENTS

VOLUME TWELVE

PALMERSTON
On the Affairs of Greece 4819

PHILLIPS
Speech at the Meeting of Catholics at Cork 4832
Speech at a Dinner at Dinas Island 4847

CRITTENDEN
On the Crittenden Compromise 4853

GUIZOT
Civilization and the Individual Man 4867
Address at the Distribution of Prizes at the University of Paris 4878
At the Unveiling of the Statue of William the Conqueror .. 4881

PEEL
On the Repeal of the Corn Laws 4886

LAMARTINE
The Revolution of 1848 4913
Manifesto to Europe 4922
Congratulatory Speech 4930
Reply to Club Delegates 4932
Reply to the Polish Deputation 4936

BERRYER
Censorship of the Press 4943

SHEIL
In Defence of Irish Catholics 4946
On the Jewish Disabilities Bill 4948

BUCHANAN
Inaugural Address 4958

HAYNE
On Foot's Resolution..... 4969

COUSIN
Eloquence as Distinguished from the Fine Arts..... 5000
Liberty..... 5010
Law..... 5013
Politics..... 5018

STEVENS
Against Webster and Northern Compromisers..... 5022
The Issue Against Andrew Johnson..... 5032

DALLAS
Eulogy on Andrew Jackson..... 5035

IRVING
The Lord Jesus Christ..... 5047

RUSSELL
On the Ballot..... 5065

HOUSTON
Speech on the Nebraska and Kansas Bill..... 5073

EVERETT
The History of Liberty..... 5080
Phi Beta Kappa Oration..... 5108
Patriotic Oration..... 5148

CORWIN
From Speech on the Mexican War..... 5184

BRYANT
Welcome to Louis Kossuth..... 5201
Address at the Founding of the Metropolitan Art Museum.. 5205
To the Mercantile Library Association..... 5211

TALFOURD
In Defence of Shelley's Works..... 5216

ARNOLD
Sermon: Alive in God..... 5250

ORATIONS

PALMERSTON

HENRY JOHN TEMPLE, third Viscount Palmerston, a distinguished English premier, was born at Broadlands, near Romsey, Hampshire, October 20, 1784, and was educated at Harrow, and St. John's College, Cambridge University. He entered Parliament in 1807, becoming a junior lord of the admiralty the same year, and from 1809 to 1828 filled the post of secretary of war. He began political life as a High Tory, but after a time adopted the views of the moderate Liberals and as such was secretary of foreign affairs, 1830-41, and again, 1846-52. For the next three years he was home secretary and at the opening of the Crimean war favored the English alliance with France against Russia. At the age of seventy he was made prime minister, resigning in 1858, but returning to power in June, 1859, and holding office until his death at Bracket Hall in Hertfordshire, October 18, 1865. He was buried in Westminster Abbey. Lord Palmerston was a member of the House of Commons continuously from his entrance in 1807 until his death, for the last thirty years representing the borough of Tiverton. As prime minister he was distinguished by his constant support of a warlike policy in foreign affairs, thus effecting in 1859 the expulsion of the Austrians from Italy. He was hardly a great man, but he was gifted with such remarkable tact, such unfailing good humor, and a firmness almost reaching to obstinacy, that he was able to accomplish results where greater men might not have succeeded. He had a genius for hard work, and, though not a brilliant speaker, occasionally rose to eloquence and was a ready debater who easily held his hearers. He possessed great self-confidence, but was free from vanity, and served England with entire faithfulness throughout his long public career.

ON THE AFFAIRS OF GREECE

DELIVERED IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS, JUNE 25, 1850

SIR,—Anxious as many members are to deliver their sentiments upon this most important question, yet I am sure they will feel that it is due to myself, that it is due to this House, that it is due to the country, that I should not permit the second night of this debate to close without having stated to the House my views upon the matters in question and my explanation of that part of my conduct for which I have been called to account.

When I say that this is an important question I say it in

the fullest expression of the term. It is a matter which concerns not merely the tenure of office by one individual, or even by a government; it is a question that involves principles of national policy and the deepest interests as well as the honor and dignity of England. I cannot think that the course which has been pursued, and by which this question has assumed its present shape, is becoming those by whose act it has been brought under the discussion of Parliament, or such as fitting the gravity and the importance of the matters which they have thus led this House and the other House of Parliament to discuss.

For if that party in this country imagine that they are strong enough to carry the government by storm, and to take possession of the citadel of office; or if, without intending to measure their strength with that of their opponents, they conceive that there are matters of such gravity connected with the conduct of the government that it becomes their duty to call upon Parliament solemnly to record its disapprobation of what has passed, I think that either in the one case or in the other that party ought not to have been contented with obtaining the expression of the opinion of the House of Lords, but they ought to have sent down their resolution for the consent and concurrence of this House; or, at least, those who act with them in political co-operation here should themselves have proposed to this House to come to a similar resolution.

But, be the road what it may, we have come to the same end; and the House is substantially considering whether they will adopt the resolution of the House of Lords, or the resolution which has been submitted to them by my honorable and learned friend the member for Sheffield [Mr. Roebuck].

Now, the resolution of the House of Lords involves the future as well as the past. It lays down for the future a prin-

ciple of national policy which I consider totally incompatible with the interests, with the rights, with the honor, and with the dignity of the country; and at variance with the practice, not only of this, but of all other civilized countries in the world. Even the person who moved it was obliged essentially to modify it in his speech. But none of the modifications contained in the speech were introduced into the resolution adopted by the other House.

The country is told that British subjects in foreign lands are entitled—for that is the meaning of the resolution—to nothing but the protection of the laws and the tribunals of the land in which they happen to reside. The country is told that British subjects abroad must not look to their own country for protection, but must trust to that indifferent justice which they may happen to receive at the hands of the government and tribunals of the country in which they may be.

The House of Lords has not said that this proposition is limited to constitutional countries. The House of Lords has not said that the proposition is inapplicable, not only to arbitrary and despotic countries, but even to constitutional countries where the courts of justice are not free; although these limitations were stated in the speech. The country is simply informed by the resolution, as it was adopted, that, so far as foreign nations are concerned, the future rule of the government of England is to be that in all cases and under all circumstances British subjects are to have that protection only which the law and the tribunals of the land in which they happen to be may give them.

Now, I deny that proposition; and I say it is a doctrine on which no British minister ever yet has acted, and on which the people of England never will suffer any British minister to act. Do I mean to say that British subjects abroad are to

be above the law, or are to be taken out of the scope of the laws of the land in which they live? I mean no such thing; I contend for no such principle. Undoubtedly, in the first instance, British subjects are bound to have recourse for redress to the means which the law of the land affords them, when that law is available for such purpose. That is the opinion which the legal advisers of the Crown have given in numerous cases; and it is the opinion on which we have founded our replies to many applications for our interposition in favor of British subjects abroad.

And allow me, at the first moment when I have occasion to mention the legal advisers of the Crown, to say that I heard with pain aspersions cast from a quarter from which they ought not to have come, upon the person who is the legal adviser of the office which I have the honor to hold. I should have thought that a person who by his own experience must have known, not only the learning, but the independence of mind and the sense of justice that characterize the distinguished individual who holds the office of Queen's Advocate would have abstained from those aspersions which have been cast upon that meritorious officer.

Perhaps I may have deviated from the strict orders of the House in what I have said; but I felt it due to an honorable-minded man to give my testimony, on the earliest occasion that presented itself, to the independence and integrity of his character.

I say, then, that if our subjects abroad have complaints against individuals, or against the government of a foreign country, if the courts of law of that country can afford them redress, then, no doubt, to those courts of justice the British subject ought in the first instance to apply; and it is only on a denial of justice, or upon decisions manifestly unjust, that the

British government should be called upon to interfere. But there may be cases in which no confidence can be placed in the tribunals, those tribunals being, from their composition and nature, not of a character to inspire any hope of obtaining justice from them.

It has been said, "We do not apply this rule to countries whose governments are arbitrary or despotic, because there the tribunals are under the control of the government, and justice cannot be had; and, moreover, it is not meant to be applied to nominal constitutional governments, where the tribunals are corrupt."

But who is to be the judge, in such a case, whether the tribunals are corrupt or not,—the British government, or the government of the State from which you demand justice?

I will take a transaction that occurred not long ago, as an instance of a case in which, I say, the people of England would not permit a British subject to be simply amenable to the law of the foreign country in which he happened to be. I am not going to talk of the power of sending a man arbitrarily to Siberia; nor of a country the constitution of which vests despotic power in the hands of the sovereign. I will take a case which happened in Sicily, where not long ago a decree was passed that any man who was found with concealed arms in his possession should be brought before a court-martial, and, if found guilty, should be shot.

Now, this happened. An innkeeper of Catania was brought before a court-martial, accused under this law by some police officers, who stated that they had discovered in an open bin, in an open stable in his inn yard, a knife, which they denounced as a concealed weapon. Witnesses having been examined, the counsel for the prosecution stated that he gave up the case, as it was evident there was no proof that the knife

belonged to the man or that he was aware it was in the place where it was found.

The counsel for the defendant said that, such being the opinion of the counsel for the prosecution, it was unnecessary for him to go into the defence, and he left his client in the hands of the court. The court, however, nevertheless pronounced the man guilty of the charge brought against him, and the next morning the man was shot.

Now, what would the English people have said if this had been done to a British subject? and yet everything done was the result of a law, and the man was found guilty of an offence by a tribunal of the country.

I say, then, that our doctrine is that in the first instance redress should be sought from the law courts of the country; but that in cases where redress cannot be so had—and those cases are many—to confine a British subject to that remedy only would be to deprive him of the protection which he is entitled to receive.

Then the question arises, how does this rule apply to the demands we have made upon Greece? And here I must shortly remind the House of the origin of our relations with Greece, and of the condition of Greece; because those circumstances are elements that must enter into the consideration of the course we have pursued.

It is well known that Greece revolted from Turkey in 1820. In 1827, England, France, and Russia determined upon interposing, and ultimately, in 1828, they resolved to employ forcible means in order to bring Turkey to acknowledge the independence of Greece. Greece, by protocol in 1830, and by treaty in 1832, was erected into a separate and independent State. And whereas nearly from the year 1820 up to the time of that treaty of 1832, when its independence was finally

acknowledged, Greece had been under a republican form of government, with an Assembly and a President, the three Powers determined that Greece should thenceforth be a monarchy.

But while England assented to that arrangement, and considered that it was better that Greece should assume a monarchical form of government, yet we attached to that assent an indispensable condition that Greece should be a constitutional monarchy. The British government could not consent to place the people of Greece, in their independent political existence, under as arbitrary a government as that from which they had revolted.

Consequently, when the three Powers, in the exercise of that function which had been devolved upon them by the authority of the General Assembly of Greece, chose a sovereign for Greece (for that choice was made in consequence of and by virtue of the authority given to them by the General Assembly of Greece), and when Prince Otho of Bavaria, then a minor, was chosen, the three Powers, on announcing the choice they had made, at the same time declared that King Otho would, in concert with his people, give to Greece constitutional institutions.

The choice and that announcement were ratified by the king of Bavaria in the name and on behalf of his son. It was, however, understood that during the minority of King Otho the establishment of the constitution should be suspended; but that when he came of age he should enter into communication with his people and together with them arrange the form of constitution to be adopted. King Otho came of age, but no constitution was given. There was a disinclination on the part of his advisers to counsel him to fulfill that engagement.

The government of England expressed an opinion, through

various channels, that that engagement ought to be fulfilled. But opinions of a different kind reached the royal ear from other quarters. Other governments naturally—I say it without implying any imputation—are attached to their own forms. Each government thinks its own form and nature the best, and wishes to see that form, if possible, extended elsewhere. Therefore I do not mention this with any intention of casting the least reproach upon Russia, or Prussia, or Austria. Those three governments at that time were despotic. Their advice was given and their influence was exerted to prevent the king of Greece from granting a constitution to his people. We thought, however, that in France we might find sympathy with our political opinions and support in the advice which we wished to give.

But we were unfortunate. The then government of France, not at all undervaluing constitutional institutions, thought that the time was not yet come when Greece could be ripe for representative government. The king of Bavaria leaned also to the same side. Therefore, from the time when the king came of age, and for several years afterward, the English government stood in this position in Greece with regard to its government—that we alone were anxious for the fulfilment of the engagement of the king, while all the other Powers who were represented at Athens were averse to its being made good, or at least were not equally desirous of urging it upon the king of Greece.

This necessarily placed us in a situation, to say the least of it, of disfavor on the part of the agents of those Powers and on the part of the government of Greece. I was sorry for it; at the same time I don't think the people of this country will be of opinion that we ought, for the sake of obtaining the mere good will of the Greek government, to have departed

from the principle which we had laid down from the beginning. But it was so; and when people talk of the antagonistic influences which were in conflict at the Greek court; and when people say, as I have heard it said, that our ministers and the ministers of foreign governments were disputing about the appointment of mirarchs and nomarchs, and God knows what petty officers of State, I say that, as far as our minister was concerned, that is a statement entirely at variance with the fact.

Our minister, Sir Edmund Lyons, never, during the whole time he was in Greece, asked any favor of any sort or kind for himself or for any friend. No conduct of that mean, and low, and petty description was carried on by any person connected with the English government. It was known that we wished the Greek nation should have representative institutions, while, on the other hand, other influences were exerted the other way; and that, and that only, was the ground of the differences which existed.

One of the evils of the absence of constitutional institutions was that the whole system of government grew to be full of every kind of abuse. Justice could not be expected where the judges of the tribunals were at the mercy of the advisers of the Crown. The finances could not be in any order where there was no public responsibility on the part of those who were to collect or to spend the revenue. Every sort of abuse was practised.

In all times in Greece, as is well known, there has prevailed, from the daring habits of the people, a system of compulsory appropriation—forcible appropriation by one man of that which belonged to another; which, of course, is very disagreeable to those who are the victims of the system, and exceedingly injurious to the social condition, im-

provement, and prosperity of the country. In short, what foreigners call brigandage, which prevailed under the Turkish rule, has not, I am sorry to say, diminished under the Greek sovereignty.

Moreover, the police of the Greek government have practised abuses of the grossest description; and if I wanted evidence on that subject I could appeal to the honorable gentleman who has just sat down, who, in a pamphlet which all must have read or ought to read, has detailed instances of barbarity of the most revolting kind practised by the police. I have here depositions of persons who have been subjected to the most abominable tortures which human ingenuity could devise—tortures inflicted upon both sexes, most revolting and disgusting.

One of the officers, a man of the name of Tzino, at the head of the police, was himself in the habit of inflicting the most diabolical tortures upon Greeks, and upon foreigners, Turks, and others. This man Tzino, instead of being punished as he ought to have been, and as he deserved to be, not only by the laws of nature, but by the laws of Greece—this person, I am sorry to say, is held in great favor in quarters where he ought to have received nothing but marks of indignation.

Well, this being the state of things in Greece, there have always been in every town in Greece a great number of persons whom we are bound to protect—Maltese, Ionians, and a certain number of British subjects. It became the practice of this Greek police to make no distinction between the Maltese and Ionians and their own fellow subjects.

We shall be told, perhaps, as we have already been told, that if the people of the country are liable to have heavy stones placed upon their breasts, and police officers to dance

upon them; if they are liable to have their heads tied to their knees, and to be left for hours in that state; or to be swung like a pendulum, and to be bastinadoed as they swing, foreigners have no right to be better treated than the natives, and have no business to complain if the same things are practised upon them. We may be told this, but that is not my opinion, nor do I believe it is the opinion of any reasonable man. Then, I say, that in considering the cases of the Ionians, for whom we demanded reparation, the House must look at and consider what was the state of things in this respect in Greece; they must consider the practices that were going on, and the necessity of putting a stop to the extension of these abuses to British and Ionian subjects by demanding compensation, scarcely, indeed, more than nominal in some cases, but the granting of which would be an acknowledgment that such things should not be done towards us in future.

In discussing these cases I am concerned to have to say that they appear to me to have been dealt with elsewhere in a spirit and in a tone which I think was neither befitting the persons concerning whom, nor the persons by whom, nor the persons before whom, the discussion took place. It is often more convenient to treat matters with ridicule than with grave argument; and we have had serious things treated jocosely; and grave men kept in a roar of laughter for an hour together at the poverty of one sufferer or at the miserable habitation of another, at the nationality of one injured man or the religion of another; as if because a man was poor he might be bastinadoed and tortured with impunity; as if a man who was born in Scotland might be robbed without redress; or, because a man is of the Jewish persuasion, he is fair game for any outrage.

It is a true saying, and has often been repeated, that a

very moderate share of human wisdom is sufficient for the guidance of human affairs. But there is another truth, equally indisputable, which is that a man who aspires to govern mankind ought to bring to the task generous sentiments, compassionate sympathies, and noble and elevated thoughts. . . .

I do not complain of the conduct of those who have made these matters the means of attack upon her Majesty's ministers. The government of a great country like this is undoubtedly an object of fair and legitimate ambition to men of all shades of opinion. It is a noble thing to be allowed to guide the policy and to influence the destinies of such a country; and, if ever it was an object of honorable ambition, more than ever must it be so at the moment at which I am speaking. For while we have seen, as stated by the right honorable baronet the member for Ripon [Sir James Graham], the political earthquake rocking Europe from side to side; while we have seen thrones shaken, shattered, levelled; institutions overthrown and destroyed; while in almost every country of Europe the conflict of civil war has deluged the land with blood from the Atlantic to the Black Sea, from the Baltic to the Mediterranean,—this country has presented a spectacle honorable to the people of England and worthy of the admiration of mankind.

We have shown that liberty is compatible with order; that individual freedom is reconcilable with obedience to the law. We have shown the example of a nation in which every class of society accepts with cheerfulness the lot which Providence has assigned to it; while at the same time every individual of each class is constantly striving to raise himself in the social scale—not by injustice and wrong, not by violence and illegality, but by persevering good conduct and by the steady and energetic exertion of the moral and intellectual faculties

with which his Creator has endowed him. To govern such a people as this is indeed an object worthy of the ambition of the noblest man who lives in the land; and therefore I find no fault with those who may think any opportunity a fair one for endeavoring to place themselves in so distinguished and honorable a position. But I contend that we have not in our foreign policy done anything to forfeit the confidence of the country. We may not, perhaps, in this matter or in that, have acted precisely up to the opinions of one person or of another—and hard indeed it is, as we all know by our individual and private experience, to find any number of men agreeing entirely in any matter, on which they may not be equally possessed of the details of the facts, and circumstances, and reasons, and conditions which led them to action. But, making allowance for those differences of opinion which may fairly and honorably arise among those who concur in general views, I maintain that the principles which can be traced through all our foreign transactions, as the guiding rule and directing spirit of our proceedings, are such as deserve approbation. I therefore fearlessly challenge the verdict which this House, as representing a political, a commercial, a constitutional country, is to give on the question now brought before it; whether the principles on which the foreign policy of her Majesty's government has been conducted, and the sense of duty which has led us to think ourselves bound to afford protection to our fellow subjects abroad, are proper and fitting guides for those who are charged with the government of England; and whether as the Roman, in days of old, held himself free from indignity when he could say *Civis Romanus sum*, so also a British subject, in whatever land he may be, shall feel confident that the watchful eye and the strong arm of England will protect him against injustice and wrong.

PHILLIPS

CHARLES PHILLIPS, an Irish barrister and statesman, was born in Sligo, Ireland, about 1787, and was educated at Trinity College, Dublin, and the Middle Temple, London. Called to the Irish bar in 1812, he was soon prominent there by reason of the florid, extravagant character of his oratory. On account of his activity in behalf of Catholic emancipation he was presented with a national testimonial in 1813. In 1821 he was called to the English bar and speedily assumed the leadership of the bar at the Old Bailey. He undoubtedly possessed real eloquence, but marred the effect of what he said by habitual over-statement. He died in London, February 1, 1859. Among his more important publications are: "The Loves of Celestine and St. Aubert" (1811); "Speeches of Charles Phillips," edited by himself (1817); "Curran and His Contemporaries" (1818); "Specimens of Irish Eloquence" (1819); "The Queen's Case Stated" (1820); "Vacation Thoughts on Capital Punishments" (1857), a work reprinted by the Quakers for their own use.

SPEECH AT AN AGGREGATE MEETING OF ROMAN CATHOLICS AT CORK

IT IS with no small degree of self-congratulation that I at length find myself in a province which every glance of the eye and every throb of the heart tell me is truly Irish; and that congratulation is not a little enhanced by finding that you receive me not quite as a stranger.

Indeed, if to respect the Christian without regard to his creed, if to love the country but the more for its calamities, if to hate oppression though it be robed in power, if to venerate integrity though it pine under persecution, give a man any claim to your recognition, then, indeed, I am not a stranger amongst you. There is a bond of union between brethren, however distant; there is a sympathy between the virtuous, however separated; there is a heaven-born instinct by which the associates of the heart become at once ac-

quainted, and kindred natures, as it were, by magic see in the face of a stranger the features of a friend.

Thus it is, that, though we never met, you hail in me the sweet association, and I feel myself amongst you even as if I were in the home of my nativity. But this my knowledge of you was not left to chance; nor was it left to the records of your charity, the memorials of your patriotism, your municipal magnificence, or your commercial splendor; it came to me hallowed by the accents of that tongue on which Ireland has so often hung with ecstacy, heightened by the eloquence and endeared by the sincerity of, I hope, our mutual friend. Let me congratulate him on having become in some degree naturalized in a province where the spirit of the elder day seems to have lingered; and let me congratulate you on the acquisition of a man who is at once the zealous advocate of your cause and a practical instance of the injustice of your oppressions. Surely, surely if merit had fair play, if splendid talents, if indefatigable industry, if great research, if unsullied principle, if a heart full of the finest affections, if a mind matured in every manly accomplishment—in short, if every noble public quality, mellowed and reflected in the pure mirror of domestic virtue, could entitle a subject to distinction in a state, Mr. O'Connell should be distinguished; but it is his crime to be a Catholic and his curse to be an Irishman.

Simpleton! he prefers his conscience to a place, and the love of his country to a participation in her plunder! Indeed he will never rise. If he joined the bigots of my sect he might be a sergeant; if he joined the infidels of your sect he might enjoy a pension, and there is no knowing whether some Orange corporator, at an Orange anniversary, might not modestly yield him the precedence of giving "the glorious and immortal memory."

Oh, yes; he might be privileged to get drunk in gratitude to the man who colonized ignorance in his native land and left to his creed the legacy of legalized persecution. Nor would he stand alone, no matter what might be the measure of his disgrace or the degree of his dereliction. You well know there are many of your own community who would leave him at the distance-post. In contemplating their recreancy I should be almost tempted to smile at the exhibition of their pretensions if there was not a kind of moral melancholy intermingled that changed satire into pity and ridicule into contempt.

For my part, I behold them in the apathy of their servitude as I would some miserable maniac in the contentment of his captivity. Poor creature! when all that raised him from the brute is levelled, and his glorious intellect is moldering in ruins, you may see him with his song of triumph and his crown of straw, a fancied freeman amid the clanking of his chains and an imaginary monarch beneath the inflictions of his keeper.

Merciful God! is it not almost an argument for the sceptic and the disbeliever, when we see the human shape almost without an aspiration of the human soul, separated by no boundary from the beasts that perish, beholding with indifference the captivity of their country, the persecution of their creed, and the helpless, hopeless destiny of their children? But they have no creed nor consciences nor country; their god is gold, their gospel is a contract, their church a counting-house, their characters a commodity; they never pray but for the opportunities of corruption, and hold their consciences, as they do their government debentures, at a price proportioned to the misfortunes of their country.

But let us turn from these mendicants of disgrace; though

Ireland is doomed to the stain of their birth, her mind need not be sullied by their contemplation. I turn from them with pleasure to the contemplation of your cause, which, as far as argument can effect it, stands on a sublime and splendid elevation. Every obstacle has vanished into air; every favorable circumstance has hardened into adamant.

The Pope, whom childhood was taught to lisp as the enemy of religion, and age shuddered at as a prescriptive calamity, has by his example put the princes of Christendom to shame. This day of miracles, in which the human heart has been strung to its extremest point of energy; this day, to which posterity will look for instances of every crime and every virtue, holds not in its page of wonders a more sublime phenomenon than that calumniated pontiff. Placed at the very pinnacle of human elevation, surrounded by the pomp of the Vatican and the splendors of the court, pouring the mandates of Christ from the throne of the Cæsars, nations were his subjects, kings were his companions, religion was his handmaid; he went forth gorgeous with the accumulated dignity of ages, every knee bending and every eye blessing the prince of one world and the prophet of another. Have we not seen him in one moment, his crown crumbled, his sceptre a reed, his throne a shadow, his home a dungeon?

But if we have, Catholics, it was only to show how inestimable is human virtue compared with human grandeur; it was only to show those whose faith was failing and whose fears were strengthening that the simplicity of the patriarchs, the piety of the saints, and the patience of the martyrs had not wholly vanished.

Perhaps it was also ordained to show the bigot at home, as well as the tyrant abroad, that though the person might be chained, and the motive calumniated, religion was still

strong enough to support her sons and to confound if she could not reclaim her enemies. No threats could awe, no promises could tempt, no sufferings could appal him; amid the damps of his dungeon he dashed away the cup in which the pearl of his liberty was to be dissolved.

Only reflect on the state of the world at that moment. All around him was convulsed, the very foundations of the earth seemed giving way; the comet was let loose, that "from its fiery hair shook pestilence and death;" the twilight was gathering, the tempest was roaring, the darkness was at hand; but he towered sublime, like the last mountain in the deluge, majestic, not less in his elevation than in his solitude, immutable amid change, magnificent amid ruin, the last remnant of earth's beauty, the last resting-place of heaven's light! Thus have the terrors of the Vatican retreated; thus has that cloud which hovered o'er your cause brightened at once into a sign of your faith and an assurance of your victory.

Another obstacle, the omnipotence of France; I know it was a pretence, but it was made an obstacle. What has become of it? The spell of her invincibility destroyed, the spirit of her armies broken, her immense boundary dismembered, and the lord of her empire become the exile of a rock. She allows fancy no fear, and bigotry no speciousness; and, as if in the very operation of the change to point the purpose of your redemption, the hand that replanted the rejected lily was that of an Irish Catholic.

Perhaps it is not also unworthy of remark that the last day of her triumph and the first of her decline was that on which her insatiable chieftain smote the holy head of your religion. You will hardly suspect I am imbued with the follies of superstition; but when the man now unborn shall trace the story of that eventful day he will see the adopted child of fortune

borne on the wings of victory from clime to clime, marking every movement with a triumph and every pause with a crown, till time, space, and seasons, nay, even nature herself, seeming to vanish from before him—in the blasphemy of his ambition he smote the apostle of his God and dared to raise the everlasting Cross amid his perishable trophies!

I am no fanatic; but is it not remarkable? May it not be one of those signs which the Deity has sometimes given in compassion to our infirmity? signs which, in the punishment of one nation, not infrequently denote the warning to another—

> "Signs sent by God to mark the will of Heaven:
> Signs which bid nations weep and be forgiven."

The argument, however, is taken from the bigot; and those whose consciousness taught them to expect what your loyalty should have taught them to repel can no longer oppose you from the terrors of invasion. Thus, then, the papal phantom and the French threat have vanished into nothing.

Another obstacle, the tenets of your creed. Has England still to learn them? I will tell her where. Let her ask Canada, the last plank of her American shipwreck. Let her ask Portugal, the first omen of her European splendor. Let her ask Spain, the most Catholic country in the universe, her Catholic friends, her Catholic allies, her rivals in the triumph, her reliance in the retreat, her last stay when the world had deserted her. They must have told her on the field of blood whether it was true that they "kept no faith with heretics."

Alas, alas! how miserable a thing is bigotry, when every friend puts it to blush and every triumph but rebukes its weakness! If England continued still to accredit this calumny, I would direct her for conviction to the hero, for whose gift alone she owes us an eternity of gratitude; whom

we have seen leading the van of universal emancipation, decking his wreath with the flowers of every soil and filling his army with the soldiers of every sect; before whose splendid dawn, every tear exhaling and every vapor vanishing, the colors of the European world have revived and the spirit of European liberty (may no crime avert the omen!) seems to have risen! Suppose he was a Catholic, could this have been? Suppose Catholics did not follow him, could this have been? Did the Catholic Cortes inquire his faith when they gave him the supreme command? Did the regent of Portugal withhold from his creed the reward of his valor? Did the Catholic soldier pause at Salamanca to dispute upon polemics? Did the Catholic chieftain prove upon Barossa that he had kept no faith with heretics? or did the creed of Spain, the same with that of France, the opposite of that of England, prevent their association in the field of liberty?

Oh, no, no, no! the citizen of every clime, the friend of every color, and the child of every creed, liberty walks abroad in the ubiquity of her benevolence, alike to her the varieties of faith and the vicissitudes of country; she has no object but the happiness of man, no bounds but the extremities of creation. Yes, yes, it was reserved for Wellington to redeem his own country when he was regenerating every other. It was reserved for him to show how vile were the aspersions on your creed, how generous were the glowings of your gratitude.

He was a Protestant, yet Catholics trusted him; he was a Protestant, yet Catholics advanced him. He is a Protestant Knight in Catholic Portugal; he is a Protestant Duke in Catholic Spain; he is a Protestant commander of Catholic armies: he is more; he is the living proof of the Catholic's liberality and the undeniable refutation of the Protestant's

injustice. Gentlemen, as a Protestant, though I may blush for the bigotry of many of my creed who continue obstinate, in the teeth of this conviction, still, were I a Catholic, I should feel little triumph in the victory. I should only hang my head at the distresses which this warfare occasioned to my country. I should only think how long she had withered in the agony of her disunion; how long she had bent, fettered by slaves, cajoled by blockheads, and plundered by adventurers; the proverb of the fool, the prey of the politician, the dupe of the designing, the experiment of the desperate; struggling as it were between her own fanatical and infatuated parties, those hell-engendered serpents which enfold her, like the Trojan seer, even at the worship of her altars, and crush her to death in the very embraces of her children! It is time (is it not?) that she should be extricated.

The act would be proud, the means would be Christian; mutual forbearance, mutual indulgence, mutual concession: I would say to the Protestant, "Concede;" I would say to the Catholic, "Forgive;" I would say to both, "Though you bend not at the same shrine, you have a common God and a common country; the one has commanded love, the other kneels to you for peace."

This hostility of her sects has been the disgrace, the peculiar disgrace of Christianity. The Gentoo loves his caste; so does the Mahometan; so does the Hindoo, whom England, out of the abundance of her charity, is about to teach her creed:—I hope she may not teach her practice.

But Christianity—Christianity alone, exhibits her thousand sects, each denouncing his neighbor here, in the name of God; and damning hereafter, out of pure devotion! "You're a heretic," says the Catholic: "You're a Papist," says the Protestant. "I appeal to Saint Peter," exclaims

the Catholic: "I appeal to Saint Athanasius," cries the Protestant: "and if it goes to damning he's as good at it as any saint in the calendar." "You'll all be damned eternally," moans out the Methodist; "I'm the elect!"

Thus it is, you see, each has his anathema, his accusation, and his retort; and in the end religion is the victim! The victory of each is the overthrow of all; and infidelity, laughing at the contest, writes the refutation of their creed in the blood of the combatants! I wonder if this reflection has ever struck any of those reverend dignitaries who rear their mitres against Catholic emancipation. Has it ever glanced across their Christian zeal, if the story of our country should have casually reached the valleys of Hindostan, with what an argument they are furnishing the heathen world against their sacred missionary? In what terms could the Christian ecclesiastic answer the Eastern Bramin, when he replied to his exhortations in language such as this?

"Father, we have heard your doctrine; it is splendid in theory, specious in promise, sublime in prospect; like the world to which it leads, it is rich in the miracles of light. But, Father, we have heard that there are times when its rays vanish and leave your sphere in darkness, or when your only lustre arises from meteors of fire and moons of blood; we have heard of the verdant island which the Great Spirit has raised in the bosom of the waters with such a bloom of beauty that the very wave she has usurped worships the loveliness of her intrusion. The sovereign of our forests is not more generous in his anger than her sons; the snow-flake, ere it falls on the mountain, is not purer than her daughters; little inland seas reflect the splendors of her landscape, and her valleys smile at the story of the serpent! Father, is it true that this isle of the sun, this people of the morning, find

the fury of the ocean in your creed and more than the venom of the viper in your policy? Is it true that for six hundred years her peasant has not tasted peace nor her piety rested from persecution? Oh, Brama! defend us from the God of the Christian! Father, Father, return to your brethren, retrace the waters; we may live in ignorance, but we live in love; and we will not taste the tree that gives us evil when it gives us wisdom. The heart is our guide, nature is our gospel; in the imitation of our fathers we found our hope; and, if we err, on the virtue of our motives we rely for our redemption."

How would the missionaries of the mitre answer him? How will they answer that insulted Being of whose creed their conduct carries the refutation?

But to what end do I argue with the bigot?—a wretch whom no philosophy can humanize, no charity soften, no religion reclaim, no miracle convert: a monster who, red with the fires of hell and bending under the crimes of earth, erects his murderous divinity upon a throne of skulls, and would gladly feed, even with a brother's blood, the cannibal appetite of his rejected altar! His very interest cannot soften him into humanity. Surely if it could, no man would be found mad enough to advocate a system which cankers the very heart of society and undermines the natural resources of government; which takes away the strongest excitement to industry by closing up every avenue to laudable ambition; which administers to the vanity or the vice of a party when it should only study the advantage of a people; and holds out the perquisites of state as an impious bounty on the persecution of religion.

I have already shown that the power of the Pope, that the power of France, and that the tenets of your creed, were but

imaginary auxiliaries to this system. Another pretended obstacle has, however, been opposed to your emancipation. I allude to the danger arising from a foreign influence. What a triumphant answer can you give to that! Methinks, as lately, I see the assemblage of your hallowed hierarchy, surrounded by the priesthood, and followed by the people, waving aloft the crucifix of Christ alike against the seductions of the court and the commands of the conclave! Was it not a delightful, a heart-cheering spectacle, to see that holy band of brothers preferring the chance of martyrdom to the certainty of promotion, and postponing all the gratifications of worldly pride to the severe but heaven-gaining glories of their poverty? They acted honestly, and they acted wisely also; for I say here, before the largest assembly I ever saw in any country—and I believe you are almost all Catholics—I say here that if the see of Rome presumed to impose any temporal mandate directly or indirectly on the Irish people, the Irish bishops should at once abandon it; or the flocks, one and all, would abjure and banish them both together. History affords us too fatal an example of the perfidious, arrogant, and venal interference of a papal usurper of former days, in the temporal jurisdiction of this country; an interference assumed without right, exercised without principle, and followed by calamities apparently without end.

Thus, then, has every obstacle vanished: but it has done more—every obstacle has, as it were by miracle, produced a powerful argument in your favor. How do I prove it? Follow me in my proofs, and you will see by what links the chain is united. The power of Napoleon was the grand and leading obstacle to your emancipation. That power led him to the menace of an Irish invasion. What did that prove? Only the sincerity of Irish allegiance. On the very threat,

we poured forth our volunteers, our yeomen, and our militia; and the country became encircled with an armed and a loyal population. Thus then the calumny of your disaffection vanished.

That power next led him to the invasion of Portugal. What did it prove? Only the good faith of Catholic allegiance. Every field in the Peninsula saw the Catholic Portuguese hail the English Protestant as a brother and a friend, joined in the same pride and the same peril. Thus, then, vanished the slander that you could not keep faith with heretics. That power next led him to the imprisonment of the Pontiff, so long suspected of being quite ready to sacrifice everything to his interest and his dominion. What did that prove? The strength of his principles, the purity of his faith, the disinterestedness of his practice. It proved a life spent in the study of the saints and ready to be closed by an imitation of the martyrs. Thus, also, was the head of your religion vindicated to Europe.

There remained behind but one impediment—your liability to a foreign influence. Now mark! The Pontiff's captivity led to the transmission of Quarantotti's rescript; and, on its arrival, from the priest to the peasant, there was not a Catholic in the land who did not spurn the document of Italian audacity! Thus, then, vanished also the phantom of a foreign influence! Is this conviction? Is not the hand of God in it? Oh yes! for observe what followed. The very moment that power which was the first and last leading argument against you had, by its special operation, banished every obstacle, that power itself, as it were by enchantment, evaporated at once; and peace with Europe took away the last pretence for your exclusion.

Peace with Europe! alas, alas, there is no peace for Ireland!

The universal pacification was but the signal for renewed hostility to us; and the mockery of its preliminaries were tolled through our provinces by the knell of the curfew. I ask, is it not time that this hostility should cease? If ever there was a day when it was necessary, that day undoubtedly exists no longer.

The Continent is triumphant, the Peninsula is free, France is our ally. The hapless house which gave birth to Jacobinism is extinct forever. The Pope has been found not only not hostile, but complying. Indeed, if England would recollect the share you had in these sublime events, the very recollection should subsidize her into gratitude. But should she not—should she, with a baseness monstrous and unparalleled, forget our services, she has still to study a tremendous lesson.

The ancient order of Europe, it is true, is restored; but what restored it? Coalition after coalition had crumbled away before the might of the conqueror; crowns were but ephemeral; monarchs only the tenants of an hour; the descendant of Frederick dwindled into a vassal; the heir of Peter shrunk into the recesses of his frozen desert; the successor of Charles roamed a vagabond, not only throneless, but houseless; every evening sun set upon a change; every morning dawned upon some new convulsion; in short, the whole political globe quivered as with an earthquake; and who could tell what venerable monument was next to shiver beneath the splendid, frightful, and reposeless heavings of the French volcano? What gave Europe peace, and England safety, amid this palsy of her princes? Was it not the Landwehr and the Landsturm and the Levy en Masse? Was it not the people—that first and last and best and noblest, as well as safest, security of a virtuous government? It is a glorious

lesson; she ought to study it in this hour of safety; but should she not——

> "Oh, woe be to the Prince who rules by fear,
> When danger comes upon him!"

She will adopt it. I hope it from her wisdom; I expect it from her policy; I claim it from her justice; I demand it from her gratitude. She must at length see that there is a gross mistake in the management of Ireland. No wise man ever yet imagined injustice to be his interest; and the minister who thinks he serves a state by upholding the most irritating and the most impious of all monopolies will one day or other find himself miserably mistaken.

This system of persecution is not the way to govern this country; at least to govern it with any happiness to itself or advantage to its rulers. Centuries have proved its total inefficiency; and if it be continued for centuries the proofs will be but multiplied. Why, however, should I blame the English people when I see our own representatives so shamefully negligent of our interest?

The other day, for instance, when Mr. Peel introduced,—aye, and passed, too,—his three newly invented penal bills, to the necessity of which every assizes in Ireland and as honest a judge as ever dignified or redeemed the ermine has given the refutation, why was it that no Irish member rose in his place to vindicate his country? Where were the nominal representatives of Ireland? Where were the renegade revilers of the demagogue? Where were the noisy proclaimers of the board? What! was there not one voice to own the country? Was the patriot of 1782 an assenting auditor? Were our hundred itinerants mute and motionless—"quite chop-fallen"—or is it only when Ireland is slandered, and her motives misrepresented, and her oppressions are basely

and falsely denied, that their venal throats are ready to echo the chorus of ministerial calumny?

Oh, I should not have to ask those questions if in the late contest for this city you had prevailed and sent Hutchinson into Parliament; he would have risen, though alone, as I have often seen him—richer not less in hereditary fame than in personal accomplishments, the ornament of Ireland as she is, the solitary remnant of what she was. If slander dared asperse her, it would not have done so with impunity. He would have encouraged the timid; he would have shamed the recreant; and though he could not save us from chains he would at least have shielded us from calumny.

Let me hope that his absence shall be but of short duration, and that this city will earn an additional claim to the gratitude of the country by electing him her representative. I scarcely know him but as a public man; and considering the state to which we are reduced by the apostacy of some, and the ingratitude of others, and venality of more, I say you should inscribe the conduct of such a man in the manuals of your devotion and in the primers of your children; but above all you should act on it yourselves.

Let me entreat of you, above all things, to sacrifice any personal differences among yourselves for the great cause in which you are embarked. Remember the contest is for your children, your country, and your God; and remember also that the day of Irish union will be the natal day of Irish liberty. When your own Parliament (which I trust in heaven we may yet see again) voted you the right of franchise and the right of purchase, it gave you, if you are not false to yourselves, a certainty of your emancipation.

My friends, farewell! This has been a most unexpected meeting to me; it has been our first—it may be our last. I

can never forget the enthusiasm of this reception. I am too much affected by it to make professions; but, believe me, no matter where I may be driven by the whim of my destiny, you shall find me one in whom change of place shall create no change of principle, one whose memory must perish ere he forgets his country, whose heart must be cold when it beats not for her happiness.

SPEECH AT A DINNER ON DINAS ISLAND IN THE LAKE OF KILLARNEY

[On Mr. Phillips's health being given, together with that of Mr. Payne, a young American.]

IT IS not with the vain hope of returning by words the kindnesses which have been literally showered on me during the short period of our acquaintance that I now interrupt for a moment the flow of your festivity. Indeed, it is not necessary; an Irishman needs no requital for his hospitality; its generous impulse is the instinct of his nature, and the very consciousness of the act carries its recompense along with it. But, sir, there are sensations excited by an allusion in your toast, under the influence of which silence would be impossible. To be associated with Mr. Payne must be, to any one who regards private virtues and personal accomplishments, a source of peculiar pride; and that feeling is not a little enhanced in me by a recollection of the country to which we are indebted for his qualifications.

Indeed, the mention of America has never failed to fill me with the most lively emotions. In my earliest infancy, that tender season when impressions at once the most permanent and the most powerful are likely to be excited, the story of her then recent struggle raised a throb in every heart that loved liberty and wrung a reluctant tribute even from dis-

comfited oppression. I saw her spurning alike the luxuries that would enervate and the legions that would intimidate, dashing from her lips the poisoned cup of European servitude and, through all the vicissitudes of her protracted conflict, displaying a magnanimity that defied misfortune and a moderation that gave new grace to victory.

It was the first vision of my childhood; it will descend with me to the grave. But if as a man I venerate the mention of America, what must be my feelings towards her as an Irishman? Never, oh never, while memory remains, can Ireland forget the home of her emigrant and the asylum of her exile. No matter whether their sorrows sprung from the errors of enthusiasm or the realities of suffering—from fancy or infliction; that must be reserved for the scrutiny of those whom the lapse of time shall acquit of partiality.

It is for the men of other ages to investigate and record it; but surely it is for the men of every age to hail the hospitality that received the shelterless and love the feeling that befriended the unfortunate. Search creation round, where can you find a country that presents so sublime a view, so interesting an anticipation? What noble institutions! What a comprehensive policy! What a wise equalization of every political advantage! The oppressed of all countries, the martyrs of every creed, the innocent victim of despotic arrogance or superstitious frenzy, may there find refuge; his industry encouraged, his piety respected, his ambition animated; with no restraint but those laws which are the same to all, and no distinction but that which his merit may originate. Who can deny that the existence of such a country presents a subject for human congratulation? Who can deny that its gigantic advancement offers a field for the most rational conjecture?

At the end of the very next century, if she proceeds as she seems to promise, what a wondrous spectacle may she not exhibit! Who shall say for what purpose a mysterious Providence may not have designed her? Who shall say that when in its follies or its crimes the Old World may have interred all the pride of its power and all the pomp of its civilization, human nature may not find its destined renovation in the New?

For myself I have no doubt of it. I have not the least doubt that when our temples and our trophies shall have mouldered into dust, when the glories of our name shall be but the legend of tradition, and the light of our achievements only live in song, philosophy will rise again in the sky of her Franklin and glory rekindle at the urn of her Washington. Is this the vision of romantic fancy? Is it even improbable? Is it half so improbable as the events which for the last twenty years have rolled like successive tides over the surface of the European world, each erasing the impressions that preceded it?

Thousands upon thousands, sir, I know there are who will consider this supposition as wild and whimsical; but they have dwelt with little reflection upon the records of the past. They have but ill observed the never-ceasing progress of national rise and national ruin. They form their judgment on the deceitful stability of the present hour, never considering the innumerable monarchies and republics in former days apparently as permanent; their very existence become now the subjects of speculation—I had almost said scepticism.

I appeal to history! Tell me, thou reverend chronicler of the grave, can all the illusions of ambition realized, can all the wealth of a universal commerce, can all the achievements of successful heroism, or all the establishments of this world's

wisdom, secure to empire the permanency of its possessions? Alas, Troy thought so once; yet the land of Priam lives only in song! Thebes thought so once; yet her hundred gates have crumbled and her very tombs are but as the dust they were vainly intended to commemorate! So thought Palmyra—where is she? So thought Persepolis, and now—

> "Yon waste, where roaming lions howl,
> Yon aisle, where moans the grey-eyed owl,
> Shows the proud Persian's great abode,
> Where sceptred once, an earthly god,
> His power-clad arm controlled each happier clime,
> Where sports the warbling muse, and fancy soars sublime."

So thought the countries of Demosthenes and the Spartan, yet Leonidas's is trampled by the timid slave, and Athens insulted by the servile, mindless, and enervate Ottoman! In his hurried march Time has but looked at their imagined immortality, and all its vanities, from the palace to the tomb, have with their ruins erased the very impression of his footsteps! The days of their glory are as if they had never been; and the island that was then a speck, rude and neglected in the barren ocean, now rivals the ubiquity of their commerce, the glory of their arms, the fame of their philosophy, the eloquence of their senate, and the inspiration of their bards! Who shall say, then, contemplating the past, that England, proud and potent as she appears, may not one day be what Athens is, and the young America yet soar to be what Athens was? Who shall say, when the European column shall have moldered, and the night of barbarism obscured its very ruins, that that mighty continent may not emerge from the horizon to rule, for its time, sovereign of the ascendant?

Such, sir, is the natural progress of human operations, and such the unsubstantial mockery of human pride. But I should, perhaps, apologize for this digression. The tombs are, at best, a sad although an instructive subject. At all

events they are ill suited to such an hour as this. I shall endeavor to atone for it by turning to a theme which tombs cannot inurn or revolution alter.

It is the custom of your board, and a noble one it is, to deck the cup of the gay with the garland of the great; and surely, even in the eyes of its deity, his grape is not the less lovely when glowing beneath the foliage of the palm-tree and the myrtle.

Allow me to add one flower to the chaplet which, though it sprang in America, is no exotic. Virtue planted it, and it is naturalized everywhere. I see you anticipate me—I see you concur with me that it matters very little what immediate spot may be the birthplace of such a man as Washington. No people can claim, no country can appropriate him; the boon of Providence to the human race, his fame is eternity, and his residence creation. Though it was the defeat of our arms and the disgrace of our policy, I almost bless the convulsion in which he had his origin. If the heavens thundered and the earth rocked, yet when the storm passed how pure was the climate that it cleared; how bright in the brow of the firmament was the planet which it revealed to us! In the production of Washington it does really appear as if nature was endeavoring to improve upon herself, and that all the virtues of the ancient world were but so many studies preparatory to the patriot of the new. Individual instances, no doubt, there were—splendid exemplifications of some single qualification.

Cæsar was merciful, Scipio was continent, Hannibal was patient; but it was reserved for Washington to blend them all in one, and like the lovely *chef d'œuvre* of the Grecian artist, to exhibit in one glow of associated beauty the pride of every model and the perfection of every master.

As a general he marshalled the peasant into a veteran and supplied by discipline the absence of experience; as a statesman he enlarged the policy of the cabinet into the most comprehensive system of general advantage; and such was the wisdom of his views and the philosophy of his counsels that to the soldier and the statesman he almost added the character of the sage! A conqueror, he was untainted with the crime of blood; a revolutionist, he was free from any stain of treason; for aggression commenced the contest, and his country called him to the command.

Liberty unsheathed his sword, necessity stained, victory returned it. If he had paused here, history might have doubted what station to assign him, whether at the head of her citizens or her soldiers, her heroes or her patriots. But the last glorious act crowns his career and banishes all hesitation. Who, like Washington, after having emancipated a hemisphere, resigned its crown and preferred the retirement of domestic life to the adoration of a land he might be almost said to have created?

> "How shall we rank thee upon glory's page,
> Thou more than soldier, and just less than sage;
> All thou hast been reflects less fame on thee,
> Far less than all thou hast forborne to be!"

Such, sir, is the testimony of one not to be accused of partiality in his estimate of America. Happy, proud America! the lightnings of heaven yielded to your philosophy! The temptations of earth could not seduce your patriotism!

I have the honor, sir, of proposing to you as a toast, THE IMMORTAL MEMORY OF GEORGE WASHINGTON.

CRITTENDEN

JOHN JORDON CRITTENDEN was born in Woodford County, Kentucky, in 1787. Afer graduating at William and Mary College he served in the War of 1812. In 1816 he became a member of the Kentucky House of Representatives, and in the following year, having just attained the requisite age, he was sent to the United States Senate, and remained a member of that body until March, 1819. During the next sixteen years he practiced law in his native State, but again represented Kentucky in the United States Senate from 1835 to 1841. He was Attorney-General of the United States under President William Henry Harrison, but, resigning upon Tyler's accession to the Presidency, he re-entered the Senate, and kept a seat there from 1842 until 1848. He was Governor of Kentucky in the years 1848–50; Attorney-General of the United States under President Fillmore from 1850 to 1853; was once more United States Senator from 1855 to 1861, after which he was sent from Kentucky to the Federal House of Representatives. He died in July, 1863. The following speech was delivered by him in advocacy of the compromise by which he hoped to avert secession.

ON THE CRITTENDEN COMPROMISE

UNITED STATES SENATE, DECEMBER 18, 1860

I AM gratified, Mr. President, to see in the various propositions which have been made, such a universal anxiety to save the country from the dangerous dissensions which now prevail; and I have, under a very serious view and without the least ambitious feeling whatever connected with it, prepared a series of constitutional amendments, which I desire to offer to the Senate, hoping that they may form, in part at least, some basis for measures that may settle the controverted questions which now so much agitate our coun-

try. Certainly, sir, I do not propose now any elaborate discussion of the subject. Before presenting these resolutions, however, to the Senate, I desire to make a few remarks explanatory of them, that the Senate may understand their general scope.

The questions of an alarming character are those which have grown out of the controversy between the northern and southern sections of our country in relation to the rights of the slave-holding States in the Territories of the United States, and in relation to the rights of the citizens of the latter in their slaves. I have endeavored by these resolutions to meet all these questions and causes of discontent, and by amendments to the Constitution of the United States, so that the settlement, if we happily agree on any, may be permanent, and leave no cause for future controversy. These resolutions propose, then, in the first place, in substance, the restoration of the Missouri Compromise, extending the line throughout the Territories of the United States to the eastern border of California, recognizing slavery in all the territory south of that line, and prohibiting slavery in all the territory north of it; with a provision, however, that when any of those Territories, north or south, are formed into States, they shall then be at liberty to exclude or admit slavery as they please; and that, in the one case or the other, it shall be no objection to their admission into the Union. In this way, sir, I propose to settle the question, both as to territory and slavery, so far as it regards the Territories of the United States.

I propose, sir, also, that the Constitution be so amended as to declare that Congress shall have no power to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia so long as slavery exists in the States of Maryland and Virginia; and that they shall

have no power to abolish slavery in any of the places under their special jurisdiction within the Southern States.

These are the constitutional amendments which I propose, and embrace the whole of them in regard to the questions of territory and slavery. There are other propositions in relation to grievances, and in relation to controversies which I suppose are within the jurisdiction of Congress, and may be removed by the action of Congress. I propose, in regard to legislative action, that the fugitive slave law, as it is commonly called, shall be declared by the Senate to be a constitutional act, in strict pursuance of the Constitution. I propose to declare that it has been decided by the Supreme Court of the United States to be constitutional, and that the Southern States are entitled to a faithful and complete execution of that law, and that no amendment shall be made hereafter to it which will impair its efficiency. But, thinking that it would not impair its efficiency, I have proposed amendments to it in two particulars. I have understood from gentlemen of the North that there is objection to the provision giving a different fee where the commissioner decides to deliver the slave to the claimant, from that which is given where he decides to discharge the alleged slave; the law declares that in the latter case he shall have but five dollars, while in the other he shall have ten dollars—twice the amount in one case than in the other. The reason for this was very obvious. In case he delivers the servant to his claimant he is required to draw out a lengthy certificate, stating the principle and substantial grounds on which his decision rests, and to return him either to the marshal or to the claimant to remove him to the State from which he escaped. It was for that reason that a larger fee was given

to the commissioner, where he had the largest service to perform. But, sir, the act being viewed unfavorably and with great prejudice, in a certain portion of the country, this was regarded as very obnoxious, because it seemed to give an inducement to the commissioner to return the slave to the master, as he thereby obtained the larger fee of ten dollars instead of the smaller one of five dollars. I have said, let the fee be the same in both cases.

I have understood, furthermore, sir, that inasmuch as the fifth section of that law was worded somewhat vaguely, its general terms had admitted of the construction in the Northern States that all the citizens were required, upon the summons of the marshal, to go with him to hunt up, as they express it, and arrest the slave; and this is regarded as obnoxious. They have said, "in the Southern States you make no such requisition on the citizen"; nor do we, sir. The section, construed according to the intention of the framers of it, I suppose, only intended that the marshal should have the same right in the execution of process for the arrest of a slave that he has in all other cases of process that he is required to execute—to call on the *posse comitatus* for assistance where he is resisted in the execution of his duty, or where, having executed his duty by the arrest, an attempt is made to rescue the slave. I propose such an amendment as will obviate this difficulty and limit the right of the master and the duty of the citizen to cases where, as in regard to all other process, persons may be called upon to assist in resisting opposition to the execution of the laws.

I have provided further, sir, that the amendment to the Constitution which I here propose, and certain other provisions of the Constitution itself, shall be unalterable, there-

by forming a permanent and unchangeable basis for peace and tranquillity among the people. Among the provisions in the present Constitution, which I have by amendment proposed to render unalterable, is that provision in the first article of the Constitution which provides the rule for representation, including in the computation three-fifths of the slaves. That is to be rendered unchangeable. Another is the provision for the delivery of fugitive slaves. That is to be rendered unchangeable.

And with these provisions, Mr. President, it seems to me we have a solid foundation upon which we may rest our hopes for the restoration of peace and goodwill among all the States of this Union, and all the people. I propose, sir, to enter into no particular discussion. I have explained the general scope and object of my proposition. I have provided further, which I ought to mention, that, there having been some difficulties experienced in the courts of the United States in the South in carrying into execution the laws prohibiting the African slave trade, all additions and amendments which may be necessary to those laws to render them effectual should be immediately adopted by Congress, and especially the provision of those laws which prohibit the importation of African slaves into the United States. I have further provided it as a recommendation to all the States of this Union, that whereas laws have been passed of an unconstitutional character (and all laws are of that character which either conflict with the constitutional acts of Congress, or which in their operation hinder or delay the proper execution of the acts of Congress), which laws are null and void, and yet, though null and void, they have been the source of mischief and discontent in the country, under the extraordinary circumstances in which we are

placed; I have supposed that it would not be improper or unbecoming in Congress to recommend to the States, both North and South, the repeal of all such acts of theirs as were intended to control, or intended to obstruct the operation of the acts of Congress, or which in their operation and in their application have been made use of for the purpose of such hindrance and opposition, and that they will repeal these laws or make such explanations or corrections of them as to prevent their being used for any such mischievous purpose.

I have endeavored to look with impartiality from one end of our country to the other; I have endeavored to search up what appeared to me to be the causes of discontent pervading the land; and, as far as I am capable of doing so, I have endeavored to propose a remedy for them. I am far from believing that, in the shape in which I present these measures, they will meet with the acceptance of the Senate. It will be sufficiently gratifying if, with all the amendments that the superior knowledge of the Senate may make to them, they shall, to any effectual extent, quiet the country.

Mr. President, great dangers surround us. The Union of these States is dear to the people of the United States. The long experience of its blessings, the mighty hopes of the future, have made it dear to the hearts of the American people. Whatever politicians may say, whatever of dissension may, in the heat of party politics, be created among our people, when you come down to the question of the existence of the Constitution, that is a question beyond all politics; that is a question of life and death. The Constitution and the Union are the life of this great people—yes, sir, the life of life. We all desire to preserve them, North

and South; that is the universal desire. But some of the Southern States, smarting under what they conceive to be aggressions of their Northern brethren and of the Northern States, are not contented to continue this Union, and are taking steps, formidable steps, toward a dissolution of the Union, and toward the anarchy and the bloodshed, I fear, that are to follow. I say, sir, we are in the presence of great events. We must elevate ourselves to the level of the great occasion. No party warfare about mere party questions or party measures ought now to engage our attention. They are left behind; they are as dust in the balance. The life, the existence of our country, of our Union, is the mighty question; and we must elevate ourselves to all those considerations which belong to this high subject.

I hope, therefore, gentlemen will be disposed to bring the sincerest spirit of conciliation, the sincerest spirit and desire to adjust all these difficulties, and to think nothing of any little concessions of opinions that they may make, if thereby the Constitution and the country can be preserved.

The great difficulty here, sir—I know it; I recognize it as the difficult question, particularly with the gentlemen from the North—is the admission of this line of division for the territory, and the recognition of slavery on the one side, and the prohibition of it on the other. The recognition of slavery on the southern side of that line is the great difficulty, the great question with them. Now, I beseech you to think, and you, Mr. President, and all, to think whether, for such a comparative trifle as that, the Union of this country is to be sacrificed. Have we realized to ourselves the momentous consequences of such an event? When has the world seen such an event? This is a

mighty empire. Its existence spreads its influence throughout the civilized world. Its overthrow will be the greatest shock that civilization and free government have received; more extensive in its consequences; more fatal to mankind and to the great principles upon which the liberty of mankind depends, than the French Revolution with all its blood, and with all its war and violence. And all for what? Upon questions concerning this line of division between slavery and freedom. Why, Mr. President, suppose this day all the Southern States, being refused this right; being refused this partition; being denied this privilege, were to separate from the Northern States, and do it peacefully, and then were to come to you peacefully and say, "Let there be no war between us; let us divide fairly the Territories of the United States"; could the northern section of the country refuse so just a demand? What would you then give them? What would be the fair proportion? If you allowed them their fair relative proportion, would you not give them as much as is now proposed to be assigned on the southern side of that line, and would they not be at liberty to carry their slaves there, if they pleased? You would give them the whole of that; and then what would be its fate?

Is it upon the general principle of humanity, then, that you (addressing Republican Senators) wish to put an end to slavery, or is it to be urged by you as a mere topic and point of party controversy to sustain party power? Surely I give you credit for looking at it upon broader and more generous principles. Then, in the worst event, after you have encountered disunion, that greatest of all political calamities to the people of this country, and the disunionists come, the separating States come, and demand or take their portion of the Territories, they can take, and will be entitled

to take, all that will now lie on the southern side of the line which I have proposed. Then they will have a right to permit slavery to exist in it; and what do you gain for the cause of anti-slavery? Nothing whatever. Suppose you should refuse their demand, and claim the whole for yourselves, that would be a flagrant injustice which you would not be willing that I should suppose would occur. But if you did, what would be the consequence? A State north and a State south, and all the States, north and south, would be attempting to grasp at and seize this territory, and to get all of it that they could. That would be the struggle, and you would have war; and not only disunion, but all these fatal consequences would follow from your refusal now to permit slavery to exist, to recognize it as existing, on the southern side of the proposed line, while you give to the people there the right to exclude it when they come to form a State government, if such should be their will and pleasure.

Now, gentlemen, in view of this subject, in view of the mighty consequences, in view of the great events which are present before you, and of the mighty consequences which are just now to take effect, is it not better to settle the question by a division upon the line of the Missouri Compromise? For thirty years we lived quietly and peacefully under it. Our people, North and South, were accustomed to look at it as a proper and just line. Can we not do so again? We did it then to preserve the peace of the country. Now you see this Union in the most imminent danger. I declare to you that it is my solemn conviction that unless something be done, and something equivalent to this proposition, we shall be a separated and divided people in six months from this time. That is my firm con-

viction. There is no man here who deplores it more than I do; but it is my sad and melancholy conviction that that will be the consequence. I wish you to realize fully the danger. I wish you to realize fully the consequences which are to follow. You can give increased stability to this Union; you can give it an existence, a glorious existence, for great and glorious centuries to come, by now setting it upon a permanent basis, recognizing what the South considers as its rights; and this is the greatest of them all; it is that you should divide the territory by this line, and allow the people south of it to have slavery when they are admitted into the Union as States, and to have it during the existence of the territorial government. That is all. Is it not the cheapest price at which such a blessing as this Union was ever purchased? You think, perhaps, or some of you, that there is no danger, that it will but thunder and pass away. Do not entertain such a fatal delusion. I tell you it is not so. I tell you that as sure as we stand here disunion will progress. I fear it may swallow up even old Kentucky in its vortex—as true a State to the Union as yet exists in the whole confederacy—unless something be done; but that you will have disunion, that anarchy and war will follow it, that all this will take place in six months, I believe as confidently as I believe in your presence. I want to satisfy you of the fact. . . .

The present exasperation, the present feeling of disunion, is the result of a long-continued controversy on the subject of slavery and of territory. I shall not attempt to trace that controversy; it is unnecessary to the occasion, and might be harmful. In relation to such controversies, I will say, though, that all the wrong is never on one side, or all the right on the other. Right and wrong, in this

world, and in all such controversies, are mingled together. I forbear now any discussion or any reference to the right or wrong of the controversy, the mere party controversy; but in the progress of party, we now come to a point where party ceases to deserve consideration, and the preservation of the Union demands our highest and our greatest exertions. To preserve the Constitution of the country is the highest duty of the Senate, the highest duty of Congress—to preserve it and to perpetuate it, that we may hand down the glories which we have received to our children and to our posterity, and to generations far beyond us. We are, Senators, in positions where history is to take notice of the course we pursue.

History is to record us. Is it to record that when the destruction of the Union was imminent; when we saw it tottering to its fall; when we saw brothers arming their hands for hostility with one another, we stood quarrelling about points of party politics; about questions which we attempted to sanctify and to consecrate by appealing to our conscience as the source of them? Are we to allow such fearful catastrophes to occur while we stand trifling away our time? While we stand thus, showing our inferiority to the great and mighty dead, showing our inferiority to the high positions which we occupy, the country may be destroyed and ruined; and to the amazement of all the world, the great Republic may fall prostrate and in ruins, carrying with it the very hope of that liberty which we have heretofore enjoyed; carrying with it, in place of the peace we have enjoyed, nothing but revolution and havoc and anarchy. Shall it be said that we have allowed all these evils to come upon our country, while we were engaged in the petty and small disputes and debates to which

I have referred? Can it be that our name is to rest in history with this everlasting stigma and blot upon it?

Sir, I wish to God it was in my power to preserve this Union by renouncing or agreeing to give up every conscientious and other opinion. I might not be able to discard it from my mind; I am under no obligation to do that. I may retain the opinion, but if I can do so great a good as to preserve my country and give it peace, and its institutions and its Union stability, I will forego any action upon my opinions. Well, now, my friends (addressing the Republican Senators), that is all that is asked of you. Consider it well, and I do not distrust the result. As to the rest of this body, the gentlemen from the South, I would say to them, can you ask more than this? Are you bent on revolution, bent on disunion? God forbid it. I cannot believe that such madness possesses the American people. This gives reasonable satisfaction. I can speak with confidence only of my own State. Old Kentucky will be satisfied with it, and she will stand by the Union and die by the Union if this satisfaction be given. Nothing shall seduce her. The clamor of no revolution, the seductions and temptations of no revolution, will tempt her to move one step. She has stood always by the side of the Constitution; she has always been devoted to it, and is this day. Give her this satisfaction, and I believe all the States of the South that are not desirous of disunion as a better thing than the Union and the Constitution, will be satisfied and will adhere to the Union, and we shall go on again in our great career of national prosperity and national glory.

But, sir, it is not necessary for me to speak to you of the consequences that will follow disunion. Who of us is not proud of the greatness we have achieved? Disunion

SIR ROBERT PEEL

and separation destroy that greatness. Once disunited, we are no longer great. The nations of the earth who have looked upon you as a formidable Power, and rising to untold and immeasurable greatness in the future, will scoff at you. Your flag, that now claims the respect of the world, that protects American property in every port and harbor of the world, that protects the rights of your citizens everywhere, what will become of it? What becomes of its glorious influence? It is gone; and with it the protection of American citizens and property. To say nothing of the national honor which it displayed to all the world, the protection of your rights, the protection of your property abroad is gone with that national flag, and we are hereafter to conjure and contrive different flags for our different republics according to the feverish fancies of revolutionary patriots and disturbers of the peace of the world. No, sir; I want to follow no such flag. I want to preserve the union of my country. We have it in our power to do so, and we are responsible if we do not do it.

I do not despair of the Republic. When I see before me Senators of so much intelligence and so much patriotism, who have been so honored by their country, sent here as the guardians of that very Union which is now in question, sent here as the guardians of our national rights, and as guardians of that national flag, I cannot despair: I cannot despond. I cannot but believe that they will find some means of reconciling and adjusting the rights of all parties, by concessions if necessary, so as to preserve and give more stability to the country and to its institutions.

GUIZOT

FRANÇOIS PIERRE GUILLAUME GUIZOT was born in 1787 at Nimes, in the south of France, where his family, who were Protestants, had long occupied a high place among the burghers of that city. Educated at Geneva, he went to Paris in 1805, to prepare for the bar, but for some years devoted himself entirely to literary pursuits. In 1812, he was appointed Professor of Modern History in Paris, and, after the restoration of the Bourbons, was made Secretary-General to the Ministry of the Interior. In 1816, he was promoted to the Council of State and to the general directorship of the departmental and communal administration of the kingdom. Having become one of the founders of the Liberal party, known as "doctrinaires," he became obnoxious to the friends of reaction, and in 1821 was deprived of his offices; four years later he was even prohibited from delivering lectures. The following five years, during which he acted as one of the leaders of the Liberal Opposition, constituted the period of his greatest literary activity. He published a collection of memoirs, bearing on the history of England, in twenty-six volumes, a similar collection relating to the history of France, in thirty-one volumes, a revised translation of Shakespeare, and the first part of his history of the English revolution. Permitted in 1828 to resume the duties of his professor's chair, he delivered a course of lectures which raised his reputation as a historian to a great height, and formed the basis of his general "History of Civilization in Europe," and "History of Civilization in France." When Louis Philippe became King of the French, the Ministry of the Interior was allotted to Guizot. Subsequently, he became Minister of Public Instruction and to a large extent must be regarded as the creator of the existing educational establishments in France. In the spring of 1840 he accepted the post of Ambassador to London, but in October of the same year he became Minister for Foreign Affairs, to which, subsequently, he added the post of Prime Minister. His administration lasted for eight years, being the longest which existed under the constitutional monarchy. When the government of Louis Philippe was overthrown, in 1848, he took refuge in London. Guizot survived the fall of the monarchy twenty-six years.

CIVILIZATION AND THE INDIVIDUAL MAN

BEING called upon to give a course of lectures, and having considered what subject would be most agreeable and convenient to fill up the short space allowed us from now to the close of the year, it has occurred to me that a general sketch of the history of modern Europe, considered more especially with regard to the progress of civilization—that a general survey of the history of European civilization, of its origin, its progress, its end, its character, would be the most profitable subject upon which I could engage your attention. . . .

I shall commence this investigation by placing before you a series of hypotheses. I shall describe society in various conditions, and shall then ask if the state in which I so describe it is, in the general opinion of mankind, the state of a people advancing in civilization—if it answer to the signification which mankind generally attaches to this word.

First, imagine a people whose outward circumstances are easy and agreeable: few taxes, few hardships; justice is fairly administered; in a word, physical existence, taken altogether, is satisfactorily and happily regulated. But with all this, the moral and intellectual energies of this people are studiously kept in a state of torpor and inertness. It can hardly be called oppression; its tendency is not of that character—it is rather compression. We are not without examples of this state of society. There have been a great number of little aristocratic republics in which the people have been thus treated, like so many flocks of

sheep, carefully tended, physically happy, but without the least intellectual and moral activity. Is this civilization? Do we recognize here a people in a state of moral and social advancement?

Let us take another hypothesis. Let us imagine a people whose outward circumstances are less favorable and agreeable; still, however, supportable. As a set-off, its intellectual and moral cravings have not here been entirely neglected. A certain range has been allowed them —some few pure and elevated sentiments have been here distributed; religious and moral notions have reached a certain degree of improvement; but the greatest care has been taken to stifle every principle of liberty. The moral and intellectual wants of this people are provided for in the way that, among some nations, the physical wants have been provided for; a certain portion of truth is doled out to each, but no one is permitted to help himself—to seek for truth on his own account. Immobility is the character of its moral life; and to this condition are fallen most of the populations of Asia, in which theocratic government restrains the advance of man: such, for example, is the state of the Hindus. I again put the same question as before: Is this a people among whom civilization is going on?

I will change entirely the nature of the hypothesis: Suppose a people among whom there reigns a very large stretch of personal liberty, but among whom also disorder and inequality almost everywhere abound. The weak are oppressed, afflicted, destroyed; violence is the ruling character of the social condition. Every one knows that such has been the state of Europe. Is this a civilized state? It may, without doubt, contain germs of civilization which

may progressively shoot up; but the actual state of things which prevails in this society is not, we may rest assured, what the common-sense of mankind would call civilization.

I pass on to a fourth and last hypothesis. Every individual here enjoys the widest extent of liberty; inequality is rare, or, at least, of a very slight character. Every one does as he likes, and scarcely differs in power from his neighbor. But then here scarcely such a thing is known as a general interest; here exist but few public ideas; hardly any public feeling; but little society; in short, the life and faculties of individuals are put forth and spent in an isolated state, with but little regard to society, and with scarcely a sentiment of its influence. Men here exercise no influence upon one another; they leave no traces of their existence. Generation after generation pass away, leaving society just as they found it. Such is the condition of the various tribes of savages; liberty and equality dwell among them, but no touch of "civilization.

I could easily multiply these hypotheses, but I presume that I have gone far enough to show what is the popular and natural signification of the word "civilization."

It is evident that none of the states which I have just described will correspond with the common notion of mankind respecting this term. It seems to me that the first idea comprised in the word "civilization" (and this may be gathered from the various examples which I have placed before you) is the notion of progress, of development. It calls up within us the notion of a people advancing, of a people in a course of improvement and melioration.

Now, what is this progress? What is this development? In this is the great difficulty. The etymology of the word seems sufficiently obvious—it points at once to

the improvement of civil life. The first notion which strikes us in pronouncing it is the progress of society; the melioration of the social state; the carrying to higher perfection the relations between man and man. It awakens within us at once the notion of an increase of national prosperity, of a greater activity and better organization of the social relations. On one hand there is a manifest increase in the power and well-being of society at large; and on the other a more equitable distribution of this power and this well-being among the individuals of which society is composed.

But the word "civilization" has a more extensive signification than this, which seems to confine it to the mere outward, physical organization of society. Now, if this were all, the human race would be little better than the inhabitants of an ant-hill or beehive; a society in which nothing was sought for beyond order and well-being—in which the highest, the sole aim, would be the production of the means of life, and their equitable distribution.

But our nature at once rejects this definition as too narrow. It tells us that man is formed for a higher destiny than this. That this is not the full development of his character—that civilization comprehends something more extensive, something more complex, something superior to the perfection of social relations, of social power and well-being.

That this is so, we have not merely the evidence of our nature, and that derived from the signification which the common-sense of mankind has attached to the word, but we have likewise the evidence of facts.

No one, for example, will deny that there are communities in which the social state of man is better—in which

the means of life are better supplied, are more rapidly produced, are better distributed than in others, which yet will be pronounced by the unanimous voice of mankind to be superior in point of civilization.

Take Rome, for example, in the splendid days of the Republic, at the close of the second Punic War; the moment of her greatest virtues, when she was rapidly advancing to the empire of the world—when her social condition was evidently improving. Take Rome again under Augustus, at the commencement of her decline, when, to say the least, the progressive movement of society halted, when bad principles seemed ready to prevail; but is there any person who would not say that Rome was more civilized under Augustus than in the days of Fabricius or Cincinnatus?

Let us look further; let us look at France in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. In a merely social point of view, as respects the quantity and the distribution of well-being among individuals, France, in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, was decidedly inferior to several of the other States of Europe; to Holland and England in particular. Social activity, in these countries, was greater, increased more rapidly, and distributed its fruits more equitably among individuals. Yet consult the general opinion of mankind, and it will tell you that France in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries was the most civilized country of Europe. Europe has not hesitated to acknowledge this fact, and evidence of its truth will be found in all the great works of European literature.

It appears evident, then, that all that we understand by this term is not comprised in the simple idea of social well-being and happiness; and, if we look a little deeper,

we discover that, besides the progress and melioration of social life, another development is comprised in our notion of civilization: namely, the development of individual life, the development of the human mind and its faculties—the development of man himself.

It is this development which so strikingly manifested itself in France and Rome at these epochs; it is this expansion of human intelligence which gave to them so great a degree of superiority in civilization. In these countries the godlike principle which distinguishes man from the brute exhibited itself with peculiar grandeur and power, and compensated in the eyes of the world for the defects of their social system. These communities had still many social conquests to make, but they had already glorified themselves by the intellectual and moral victories they had achieved. Many of the conveniences of life were here wanting; from a considerable portion of the community were still withheld their natural rights and political privileges; but see the number of illustrious individuals who lived and earned the applause and approbation of their fellowmen. Here, too, literature, science, and art attained extraordinary perfection, and shone in more splendor than perhaps they had ever done before. Now, wherever this takes place, wherever man sees these glorious idols of his worship displayed in their full lustre—wherever he sees this fund of rational and refined enjoyment for the godlike part of his nature called into existence, there he recognizes and adores civilization.

Two elements, then, seem to be comprised in the great fact which we call civilization; two circumstances are necessary to its existence—it lives upon two conditions—it reveals itself by two symptoms: the progress of society, the

progress of individuals; the melioration of the social system, and the expansion of the mind and faculties of man. Wherever the exterior condition of man becomes enlarged, quickened, and improved; wherever the intellectual nature of man distinguishes itself by its energy, brilliancy, and its grandeur; wherever these two signs concur, and they often do so, notwithstanding the gravest imperfections in the social system, there man proclaims and applauds civilization.

Such, if I mistake not, would be the notion mankind in general would form of civilization from a simple and rational inquiry into the meaning of the term. This view of it is confirmed by history. If we ask of her what has been the character of every great crisis favorable to civilization, if we examine those great events which all acknowledge to have carried it forward, we shall always find one or other of the two elements which I have just described. They have all been epochs of individual or social improvement—events which have either wrought a change in individual man, in his opinions, his manners; or, in his exterior condition, his situation as regards his relations with his fellowmen. Christianity, for example —I allude not merely to the first moment of its appearance, but to the first centuries of its existence—Christianity was in no way addressed to the social condition of man; it distinctly disclaimed all interference with it. It commanded the slave to obey his master. It attacked none of the great evils, none of the gross acts of injustice by which the social system of that day was disfigured; yet who but will acknowledge that Christianity has been one of the greatest promoters of civilization? And wherefore? Because it has changed the interior condition of

man, his opinions, his sentiments; because it has regenerated his moral, his intellectual character.

We have seen a crisis of an opposite nature; a crisis affecting not the intellectual, but the outward condition of man, which has changed and regenerated society. This also, we may rest assured, is a decisive crisis of civilization. If we search history through, we shall everywhere find the same result; we shall meet with no important event, which had a direct influence in the advancement of civilization, which has not exercised it in one of the two ways I have just mentioned. . . .

When any great change takes place in the state of a country—when any great development of social prosperity is accomplished within it—any revolution or reform in the powers and privileges of society, this new event naturally has its adversaries. It is necessarily contested and opposed. Now what are the objections which the adversaries of such revolutions bring against them?

They assert that this progress of the social condition is attended with no advantage; that it does not improve in a corresponding degree the moral state—the intellectual powers of man; that it is a false, deceitful progress, which proves detrimental to his moral character, to the true interests of his better nature. On the other hand, this attack is repulsed with much force by the friends of the movement. They maintain that the progress of society necessarily leads to the progress of intelligence and morality; that, in proportion as the social life is better regulated, individual life becomes more refined and virtuous. Thus the question rests in abeyance between the opposers and partisans of the change.

But reverse this hypothesis: suppose the moral devel-

opment in progress. What do the men who labor for it generally hope for? What, at the origin of societies, have the founders of religion, the sages, poets, and philosophers, who have labored to regulate and refine the manners of mankind, promised themselves? What but the melioration of the social condition; the more equitable distribution of the blessings of life? What, now, let me ask, should be inferred from this dispute and from those hopes and promises? It may, I think, be fairly inferred that it is the spontaneous, intuitive conviction of mankind; that the two elements of civilization—the social and moral development—are intimately connected; that, at the approach of one, man looks for the other. It is to this natural conviction we appeal when, to second or combat either one or the other of the two elements, we deny or attest its union with the other. We know that if men were persuaded that the melioration of the social condition would operate against the expansion of the intellect, they would almost oppose and cry out against the advancement of society. On the other hand, when we speak to mankind of improving society by improving its individual members, we find them willing to believe us, and to adopt the principle. Hence, we may affirm that it is the intuitive belief of man that these two elements of civilization are intimately connected, and that they reciprocally produce one another.

If we now examine the history of the world, we shall have the same result. We shall find that every expansion of human intelligence has proved of advantage to society; and that all the great advances in the social condition have turned to the profit of humanity. One or other of these facts may predominate, may shine forth with greater splen-

dor for a season, and impress upon the movement its own particular character. At times, it may not be till after the lapse of a long interval, after a thousand transformations, a thousand obstacles, that the second shows itself and comes, as it were, to complete the civilization which the first had begun; but when we look closely, we easily recognize the link by which they are connected. The movements of Providence are not restricted to narrow bounds; it is not anxious to deduce to-day the consequence of the premises it laid down yesterday. It may defer this for ages, till the fulness of time shall come. Its logic will not be less conclusive for reasoning slowly. Providence moves through time, as the gods of Homer through space—it makes a step, and ages have rolled away! How long a time, how many circumstances intervened, before the regeneration of the moral powers of man by Christianity exercised its great, its legitimate influence upon his social condition? Yet who can doubt or mistake its power?

If we pass from history to the nature itself of the two facts which constitute civilization, we are infallibly led to the same result. We have all experienced this. If a man make a mental advance, some mental discovery, if he acquire some new idea, or some new faculty, what is the desire that takes possession of him at the very moment he makes it? It is the desire to promulgate his sentiment to the exterior world—to publish and realize his thought. When a man acquires a new truth—when his being in his own eyes has made an advance, has acquired a new gift, immediately there becomes joined to this acquirement the notion of a mission. He feels obliged, impelled, as it were, by a secret interest, to extend, to carry out of himself the change, the melioration which has been accomplished

within him. To what but this do we owe the exertions of great reformers? The exertions of those great benefactors of the human race, who have changed the face of the world, after having first been changed themselves, have been stimulated and governed by no other impulse than this.

So much for the change which takes place in the intellectual man. Let us now consider him in a social state. A revolution is made in the condition of society. Rights and property are more equitably distributed among individuals; this is as much as to say, the appearance of the world is purer—is more beautiful. The state of things, both as respects governments, and as respects men in their relations with each other, is improved. And can there be a question whether the sight of this goodly spectacle, whether the melioration of this external condition of man, will have a corresponding influence upon his moral, his individual character—upon humanity? Such a doubt would belie all that is said of the authority of example and of the power of habit, which is founded upon nothing but the conviction that exterior facts and circumstances, if good, reasonable, well-regulated, are followed, sooner or later, more or less completely, by intellectual results of the same nature, of the same beauty; that a world better governed, better regulated, a world in which justice more fully prevails, renders man himself more just; that the intellectual man, then, is instructed and improved by the superior condition of society, and his social condition, his external well-being, meliorated and refined by increase of intelligence in individuals; that the two elements of civilization are strictly connected; that ages, that obstacles of all kinds, may interpose between them; that it is possible they may un-

dergo a thousand transformations before they meet together; but that sooner or later this union will take place is certain, for it is a law of their nature that they should do so—the great facts of history bear witness that such is really the case—the instinctive belief of man proclaims the same truth.

ADDRESS AT THE DISTRIBUTION OF PRIZES AT THE UNIVERSITY OF PARIS

DELIVERED AUGUST 10, 1833

YOUNG STUDENTS,—It would be impossible for any one here present to say for whom this occasion has the most charm,—for you who come here to receive the crowns which you have won, for your friends who see them placed upon your heads, or for your instructors who have taught you how to deserve them.

Teachers, friends, pupils, enjoy to the utmost this festival, for it is the worthy reward of a year's regular and assiduous labor. Discipline has everywhere maintained order, which is the only guarantee of effectual work and legitimate success. Ideas foreign to the acquisition of knowledge have not been allowed to divert the attention or weaken the mind. Youth animated, as it should be, by enthusiasm, fervid yet controlled, has applied itself to the achievement of victories which to-day we proclaim. The course of study itself has experienced the effect of this salutary influence. More varied than at any other epoch, it is no less solid, which is the only condition under which the extension of instruction can be called progress. Without doubt, just in proportion as the human mind explores new fields, public instruction should follow and increase with it. But if it should lose its force, if understand-

ing and appreciation of the enduring standards of truth and beauty were to become less, then there would be in its place only decadence.

It is possible for intellects, like empires, to decline and become enfeebled through excess of pride and acquisition. Taken by itself the amount of knowledge acquired at your age is of small account, but to come from our schools with minds sound, active, discriminating, well-trained, that makes you worthy of your country's pride.

It is in maintaining the intimate alliance of letters, of philosophy, and of science that we obtain the best results. What time, what circumstances, were ever more propitious for it than our own? It is the honor of the government that France has at last established that there is no reason to doubt the most brilliant progress in civilization, nor the freest development of the human mind exempt from all cowardly distrust as well as from all self-interested prejudice; it can, it will, it must be wise enough to honor and encourage literature, which is civilization itself; philosophy, which elevates and emancipates the soul; and the sciences, which set right the ideas of man and extend his power. What future have they not the right to hope under this reign of reason, for which every improvement, every truth is a force and a guarantee. This future will not fail us; we shall see literature, philosophy, and science working together; soon the influence of practical instruction will be felt in the humblest dwelling, and higher education even more advanced. The State will lend its power, liberty its impulsion, and in this unity of effort the public schools will be ever the first to recognize and to serve the legitimate needs of society.

Let us not forget that the greatest destinies have their trials, and the happiest conditions their perils. Freed from the im-

pediments which have so long weighed upon human intelligence and borne it down, too many people have been induced to believe that instruction should be, above all, apt and easy, education unexacting, and that prolonged study and severe regulations should henceforth be out of date. The studies in our schools, also the knowledge commonly displayed in society, show quickly the error of this presumption.

But I look about me, gentlemen, and I am reassured. This corps of teachers recognizes and avoids that danger. It is its mission to separate with care, and to combat whatever there may be false and dangerous in the ideas of the moment and the thoughtless impulses of youth. Already, and on more than one occasion, it has shown its comprehension of, and fulfilled this necessary mission. It has protected by turns religion, higher education, and popular instruction against frivolous indifference or powerful enmity. Protected by the morality and the independence of their task, these instructors, far from truckling to the spirit which seemed to prevail, have ever labored to preserve the growing generations from the errors and misfortunes into which their unguided inclinations might lead them. It will persevere in this difficult but salutary effort.

And you yourselves, young students, despite the inexperience and wilfulness natural to your age, you will comprehend the regulations of which you are the object; you will acquiesce in their severity; you yourselves will aid your masters in giving you that training which is in accord with reason and the laws of divine Providence. Do not beguile yourselves with vain illusions; do not flatter yourselves that in the labors which will follow that of our schools you will encounter the same support, or that the same friendly interest will surround you at the moment of success!

The world awaits you with its engrossing interests, its indifference, its heartless rivalries, its hasty judgments! Upon the world's stage, life is always laborious, oftentimes arduous! May your education have prepared you for its trials instead of concealing them!

Congratulate yourselves upon finding in our schools this discipline, these habits of order and respect, these great principles that fortify the soul, that will enable you to triumph in the formidable struggles of real life as you have come forth victorious in the pleasurable contests of youth.

May your friends be congratulated also with you; may they second your instructors and yourselves in your efforts to imprint upon national education a stamp strong in morality and wisdom. It is our duty to move ever toward this end; it will one day be your happiness that we have devoted ourselves to its attainment.

AT THE UNVEILING OF THE STATUE OF WILLIAM THE CONQUEROR

DELIVERED AT FALAISE, OCTOBER 26, 1851

YOU afford to-day, gentlemen, a rare example, an example of memory faithful, enduring, and reaching backward through the centuries!

Nearly eight hundred years ago William the Conqueror died, abandoned and alone, in this Normandy which owes to him its greatness. With great difficulty attendants were found at Rouen to guard his body and escort his bier; at Caen it was hard to obtain the few feet of earth for his burial. You atone to-day for this indifference on the part of his contemporaries; by your persevering efforts and by the talent of an eminent artist King William is reinstated in his native city;

Falaise gives back to him, after eight centuries, the glory which from him she received.

It is honorable to do justice to a great man! He should no more be flattered after death than during life; his errors, his misdeeds, his vices, and the crimes he committed should be brought to light and severely judged. But this just severity once shown, the wrong once recognized and treated as it deserved, when the man has been really great, he remains great, despite his imperfections thus disclosed; and then it becomes also a duty to extol his merits and honor his memory with pomp and ceremony: for great men make the glory of a people, even though they may have been harsh masters and their glory dearly bought.

William of Normandy was truly a great man; and if the greatness of princes is estimated, as it should be, by the difficulty of their undertakings and the importance of the results, there are few that are superior to him.

Call to mind, gentlemen, an enterprise accomplished in our days, under our very eyes—the expedition to Algiers in 1830. The case in question was the embarkation and transportation of an army of thirty thousand men to the farther shore of the Mediterranean to demand of a barbarian just satisfaction. What immense preparations! What care! What effort! What mighty resources displayed by our all-powerful civilization! And all this was judged necessary in proportion as the enterprise was considered difficult! And when the day of trial came nothing was found to be superfluous for success; and the success of the enterprise made the fame of its leaders.

In the eleventh century, society hardly emerged from barbarism, without any of the resources civilization and science give to us, Duke William gathered together, embarked, transported across the Channel, and landed upon an enemy's soil

more than thirty thousand men, and, scarcely landed, won victories and conquered a kingdom. So much for the difficulty of the undertaking! So much for the grandeur of the result!

Not only did William cross the sea with his army upon frail barks; not only did he conquer a kingdom; he did much more than that; he founded a State. He established with strength and solidity on foreign soil his power and his race; he framed new laws; he introduced a new language, and his work, lasting through centuries, still endures, and it is still in the language of King William that England's noble Queen is addressed in her Parliament, and that in which she responds.

We have seen, gentlemen, conquests equally vast, equally brilliant, as those of King William. Their duration has been hardly longer than their accomplishment. It is a rare phenomenon when invasions result in the foundation of governments. William achieved this work. He was in complete accord with the spirit and permanent interests of his time; he had the good sense to preserve, as well as the genius to conquer.

We have certainly the right, gentlemen, to render him this justice, for his glory cost us very dear. It had its origin in that national struggle which endured for more than three centuries between France and England, each being anxious to subjugate and possess the other. William, in establishing but partial and precarious bonds between the two nations, was the cause of that era of implacable hostility and of all the wars waged between them, until finally each became independent of the other.

We have come forth victors from this great conquest. We have reconquered, one after the other, all portions of our own

territory and gloriously assured our national independence. That figure without parallel in the history of the world, having the nature of both angel and hero, Joan of Arc, made of no avail what the successors of William wished to do to France; and in this same land, in this same city of Rouen, where King William died, the virgin warrior sealed with her martyrdom the deliverance of her country.

I pass from these memories of the past, both sad and glorious! I no longer give heed save to ourselves and the history of our own time. In our days, also, numerous vessels crowd our shores and take on board thousands of persons for transportation to England. Is it a new war which there they go to carry and to find? No, gentlemen, it is peace which they carry and which draws them thither; they go in search neither of adventure nor of conquest; they go to offer and to receive the pledges of reciprocal prosperity. The relations of the two nations are now as peaceful as frequent and active. A palace of crystal where they assemble together, a cord invisible, a light flashing under the waves, which transmits from one to the other the announcement of their needs and of their mutual service; there you behold the bonds which to-day replace those that William the Conqueror wished to form!

Which of the two epochs, gentlemen, is the happier? Which of the two spectacles the more beautiful? Assuredly, even in the midst of the trials and uncertainties weighing upon us in our agitated and precarious state, we have reason to be, in our time, proud and full of anticipation, provided that our hope and our pride do not cause our indulgence in the pretensions and chimeras of foolish self-satisfaction. We can praise with good reason the accomplishments and marvels of our civilization, provided that our civilization itself is not a crystal palace, to be admired and then suddenly to disappear,

and of which one is not obliged to say, in the language of a great poet given by Normandy to France—

> "And as it has the brilliancy of glass,
> Has likewise its fragility."

I do not wish, in the midst of this time of rejoicing, to utter words of sadness, but you will pardon me, gentlemen, the expression of a sentiment shared by all sensible and all worthy people.

When tossed about in mid-ocean and by violent tempests, it is of small moment that the vessel be fine, well-armed, thoroughly provided and manned with sailors intelligent and brave; it is necessary, it is more necessary than aught else, that the crew be united and that the ship have strong anchors, for therein depends her safety. Let us bind ourselves firmly together, gentlemen, and unitedly lay hold of the strong anchor of Society! God will give us the strength if we do what is requisite to deserve it!

[Specially translated by Mary Emerson Adams.]

PEEL

SIR ROBERT PEEL, an English statesman, the son of a wealthy manufacturer, was born near Bray, in Lancashire, February 5, 1788. He received his education at Harrow and Christ Church College, Oxford University, and entering Parliament at twenty-one, as member for Cashel, was soon made under-colonial secretary. In 1812 he was appointed chief secretary for Ireland, a post which he held for six years, stoutly maintaining the cause of Protestant ascendancy the while, for which he was nicknamed "Orange Peel" by his opponents. In May, 1819, he introduced into Parliament certain resolutions respecting the currency. Upon these resolutions was subsequently based "Peel's Act" providing for resumption of specie payments on May 1, 1823. From 1822 to 1827 Peel was home secretary in Lord Liverpool's cabinet, and in 1828, again became home secretary, and leader of the House for the first time. In the following year he moved the bill for Catholic emancipation, thus partially severing himself from the Tory policy. Nevertheless he resisted the parliamentary reform measures of the next few years, and declined the premiership offered him on condition of introducing extensive reform measures. From December 9, 1834, to April 8, 1835, Peel was prime minister, and for several years following led the Conservative Opposition. From 1841 to 1846 he again held the post of prime minister and in this period his political opinions underwent a marked change. From being a protectionist and a Conservative, he gradually became a free-trader and a Whig, eloquently supporting the repeal of the corn laws in 1846. This brought about the downfall of his ministry and for the remainder of his life he continued to be a Whig leader and free-trader. He died in London, July 2, 1850. Peel was a profound lover of his country's welfare and always acted from a firm sense of what his duty to the public required. Among his more important achievements were the mitigation of the severity of the penal laws, the establishment of a sound financial system, free commerce, security from civil disorders, and the introduction of cheap breadstuffs.

ON THE REPEAL OF THE CORN LAWS

DELIVERED IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS, MAY 15, 1846

SIR,—I believe it is now nearly three months since I first proposed, as the organ of her Majesty's government, the measure which I trust is about to receive to-night the sanction of the House of Commons; and, considering the lapse of time—considering the frequent discussions—con-

sidering the anxiety of the people of this country that these debates should be brought to a close, I feel that I should be offering an insult to the House—I should be offering an insult to the country, if I were to condescend to bandy personalities upon such an occasion.

Sir, I foresaw that the course which I have taken from a sense of public duty would expose me to serious sacrifices. I foresaw, as its inevitable result, that I must forfeit friendships which I most highly valued—that I must interrupt political relations in which I felt a sincere pride; but the smallest of all the penalties which I anticipated were the continued venomous attacks of the member for Shrewsbury [Mr. Disraeli]. Sir, I will only say of that honorable gentleman, that if he, after reviewing the whole of my public life—a life extending over thirty years previously to my accession to office in 1841—if he then entertained the opinion of me which he now professes; if he thought I was guilty of these petty larcenies from Mr. Horner and others, it is a little surprising that in the spring of 1841, after his long experience of my public career, he should have been prepared to give me his confidence.

It is still more surprising that he should have been ready—as I think he was—to unite his fortunes with mine in office, thus implying the strongest proof which any public man can give of confidence in the honor and integrity of a minister of the Crown.

Sir, I have explained more than once what were the circstances under which I felt it my duty to take this course. I did feel in November last that there was just cause for apprehension of scarcity and famine in Ireland. I am stating what were the apprehensions I felt at that time, what were the motives from which I acted; and those apprehensions,

though they may be denied now, were at least shared then by those honorable gentlemen who sit below the gangway [the protectionists]. The honorable member for Somersetshire [Sir T. A. Acland] expressly declared that at the period to which I referred he was prepared to acquiesce in the suspension of the corn laws. An honorable member also, a recent addition to this House, who spoke with great ability the other night, the honorable member for Dorsetshire [Mr. Seymer], distinctly declared that he thought I should have abandoned my duty if I had not advised that, considering the circumstances of Ireland, the restrictions on the importation of foreign corn should be temporarily removed.

I may have been wrong, but my impression was, first, that my duty toward a country threatened with famine required that that which had been the ordinary remedy under all similar circumstances should be resorted to—namely, that there should be free access to the food of man from whatever quarter it might come. I was prepared to give the best proof which public men generally can give of the sincerity of their opinions, by tendering my resignation of office and devolving upon others the duty of proposing this measure; and, sir, I felt this—that if these laws were once suspended, and there was unlimited access to food the produce of other countries, I, and those with whom I acted, felt the strongest conviction that it was not for the public interest, that it was not for the interest of the agricultural party, that an attempt should be made permanently to reimpose restrictions on the importation of food.

I could not propose the re-establishment of the existing law with any guarantee for its permanence. As the noble lord says, I had acted with Mr. Huskisson in 1822, 1825, and 1826, in revising the commercial system and applying to that

system the principles of free trade. In 1842, after my accession to office, I proposed a revision of the corn laws. Had anything taken place at the election of 1844 which precluded that revision? Was there a public assurance given to the people of this country, at the election of 1841, that the existing amount of protection to agriculture should be retained? ["Yes, yes!"] There was, was there? Then, if there was, you were as guilty as I. What was the assurance given? If it was that the amount of protection to agriculture which existed in 1843 and 1841 should be retained, opposition ought to have been made by you to the revision of that system in 1842.

Why was the removal of the prohibition on the importation of foreign meat and foreign cattle assented to? That removal must have been utterly at variance with any assurance that the protection to agriculture which existed in 1840 and 1841 should be retained. Yet that removal was voted by the House by large majorities; and after the bill of 1842 was I not repeatedly asked this question, "Now that you have passed this bill establishing a new corn law, will you give a public assurance that to that you will at all times adhere?"

Did I not uniformly decline to give any such assurance? I said I had no intention of proposing an alteration of that law at the time when the question was put to me; but I distinctly declared that I would not fetter forever my discretion by giving such a pledge. These things are on record. It was quite impossible for me, consistently with my own convictions, after a suspension of import duties, to propose the re-establishment of the existing law with any security for its continuance. Well, then, the question which naturally arose was this—Shall we propose some diminished protection to agriculture, or, in the state of public feeling which will exist

after the suspension of restriction, shall we propose a permanent and ultimate settlement of the question? To be of any avail, it must have been diminished greatly below its present standard, and that diminution, I believe, would have met with as much opposition from the agricultural body as the attempt finally to settle the question.

And now, after all these debates, I am firmly convinced that it is better for the agricultural interest to contemplate the final settlement of this question, rather than to attempt the introduction of a law giving a diminished protection. My belief is that a diminished protection would in no respect conciliate agricultural feeling; and this I must say, nothing could be so disadvantageous as to give an ineffectual protection and yet incur all the odium of giving an adequate one. What have we been told during this discussion?

With scarcely an exception I have listened attentively to every speech that has been made on this side of the House; and, admitting the talent that has been displayed, I confess they have in no respect altered the conviction upon which I have acted. You tell me it would have been possible, with such support as I should have received, to have continued the existing law; I believe it might have been. As far as the gratification of any personal object of ambition is concerned——

[Interruption.]

I am perfectly ready to listen to any reply that may be made to my observations, and I think it is hardly fair to attempt to interrupt me by such exclamations, but it has so far succeeded.

I am told that it would have been possible to continue this protection; but after the suspension of it—for I now assume that the suspension would have been assented to on ac-

count of the necessities of Ireland—the difficulty of maintaining it would have been greatly increased; because it would have been shown, after the lapse of three years, that, although it had worked tolerably well during the continuance of abundance, or at least of average harvests, yet at the moment it was exposed to the severe trial of scarcity it then ceased to effect the object for which it was enacted, and that, in addition to the state of public feeling with reference to restrictions on imports generally, would have greatly added to the difficulty of maintaining the law. There would have been public proof of its inefficiency for one of the great objects for which it was enacted.

But let me say, although it has not been brought prominently under consideration, that, without any reference to the case of Ireland, the working of the law, as far as Great Britain is concerned, during the present year has not been satisfactory. You would have had to contend not merely with difficulties arising from suspension on account of the case of Ireland, but it would have been shown to you that the rate of duty has been high on account of the apparent lowness in the price of corn; while that lowness of price has arisen not from abundance in quantity, but from deficient quality. It would have been shown, and conclusively, that there are greater disparities of price in most of the principal markets of this country—between corn of the highest quality and of the lowest—than have ever existed in former periods. It would have been proved that there never was a greater demand than there has been during the present year for wheat of fine quality for the purpose of mixing with wheat of inferior quality, which forms the chief article brought for sale into our domestic markets. It would have been shown you that had there been free access to wheat of higher quality

than they have assumed, the whole population of this country would for the last four months have been consuming bread of a better quality.

My belief, therefore, is that in seeking the re-enactment of the existing law after its suspension you would have had to contend with greater difficulties than you anticipate. Still I am told, "You would have had a majority." I think a majority might have been obtained. I think you could have continued this law, notwithstanding these increased difficulties, for a short time longer; but I believe that the interval of its maintenance would have been but short, and that there would have been, during the period of its continuance, a desperate conflict between different classes of society; that your arguments in favor of it would have been weak; that you might have had no alternative at an early period, had the cycle of unfavorable harvests returned—and who can give an assurance that they would not?—that you might at an early period have had no alternative but to concede an alteration of this law under circumstances infinitely less favorable than the present to a final settlement of the question.

The honorable gentleman the member for Dorsetshire said: "We can fight the league with their own weapons;" that is to say, finding that we cannot control by law those measures resorted to by the Anti-Corn-Law League, which I cannot defend, and which I very sincerely regret were ever resorted to—the establishment of voters in counties, not being naturally voters in those counties—the honorable gentleman said:

"We can make faggot votes as well as they;" and the landed interest, he said, by the greater facilities which they possess, would be able to beat the league. Well, but what a sad alternative is this! What a sad conflict to be carrying

on! Even admitting that it would be necessary, and might be done from honest convictions of that necessity, could you do it without destroying the county constituencies? Surely it is wise to consider the alternative; and, believe me, you who are anxious for the maintenance of the aristocratic system, you who desire wisely, and justly desire, to discourage the infusion of too much of the democratic principle into the constitution of the country, although you might for a time have relied on the faggot votes you created in a moment of excitement, yet the interval would not be long before that weapon would break short in your hands! You would find that those additional votes created for the purpose of combating the votes of the league, though when brought up at the first election, under the influence of an excitement connected with the corn laws, they might have been true to your side, yet, after the lapse of a short time, some exciting question connected with democratic feelings would arise, and then your votes and the votes of the league, not being subjected to legitimate influence, would unite, and you would find you had entailed on the country permanent evils, destroying the constitution for the purpose of providing a temporary remedy.

It was the foresight of these consequences—it was the belief that you were about to enter into a bitter and, ultimately, an unsuccessful struggle, that has induced me to think that for the benefit of all classes, for the benefit of the agricultural class itself, it was desirable to come to a permanent and equitable settlement of this question.

These are the motives on which I acted. I know the penalty to which I must be subject for having so acted; but I declare, even after the continuance of these debates, that I am only the more impressed with the conviction that the policy we advise is correct.

An honorable gentleman in the course of this evening, the honorable member for Sunderland [Mr. Hudson], informed us that he had heard that there was excitement about the corn laws; but he undertook to give a peremptory contradiction to that report, for he never recollected any public question being proposed involving such great interests, which, on the whole, was received by all classes concerned—by the manufacturing and by the agricultural classes—with less excitement and with a greater disposition to confide in the wisdom of the decision of Parliament. Well, if that be so—if this question is proposed at such a time—[Mr. Hudson.—No, no.] I certainly understood the honorable member to make that statement. [Mr. Hudson.—I will explain after.] I may be mistaken, and of course I am if the honorable member says so; but I understood him to say that so far from there being any undue excitement he thought that there was much less than could have been expected, and that all parties were disposed to acquiesce in the decision of Parliament.

[Mr. Hudson.—What I stated, I believe, was this, that there was no excitement in favor of the bill—not that there was a deep feeling on the part of the agriculturists against it, but that there was no public excitement in its favor.]

That varies very little from the expressions I used, and entirely justifies the inference which I drew. If there be no excitement in favor of the bill, and no strong feeling on the part of the agriculturists against it, it appears to me that this is not an unfavorable moment for the dispassionate consideration by Parliament of a subject otherwise calculated to promote excitement on the part of one class, and to cause great apprehension on the part of the other; and the honorable member's statement is a strong confirmation of my belief that it is wise to undertake the settlement of this question when

there is such absence of excitement, rather than to wait until a period when unfavorable harvests and depressed manufactures may have brought about a state of things which may render it less easy for you to exercise a dispassionate judgment on the matter.

Sir, I do not rest my support of this bill merely upon the temporary ground of scarcity in Ireland. I do not rest my support of the bill upon that temporary scarcity; but I believe that scarcity left no alternative to us but to undertake the consideration of this question; and, that consideration being necessary, I think that a permanent adjustment of the question is not only imperative, but the best policy for all concerned.

And I repeat now, that I have a firm belief that it is for the general benefit of all—for the best interests of the country, independent of the obligation imposed on us by temporary scarcity, it is for the general interests of the great body of the people that an arrangement should be made for a permanent removal of the restrictions upon the introduction of food.

I will assign my reasons for that opinion. I take my facts from the opponents of this measure. I take the speech of the honorable gentleman the member for Oxfordshire [J. W. Henley]—a speech distinguished by all the ability and usual earnestness and research of the honorable gentleman. We shall have no difference respecting our facts, for I shall take them from the opponents of the measure. The only question is as to the just inference to be drawn from these facts.

The honorable gentleman said:

"Allowing that the facts and figures which we have produced for the last thirty years are correct, then I find that there has been a great increase in trade; that there has been a cheapening of commodities; but there has been no improve-

ment in the social condition of the great masses of the people."

Now, all of you admit that the real question at issue is the improvement of the social and moral condition of the masses of the population; we wish to elevate in the gradation of society that great class which gains its support by manual labor—that is agreed on all hands. The mere interest of the landlords, the mere interest of the occupying tenants, important as they are, are subordinate to the great question—What is calculated to increase the comforts, to improve the condition, and elevate the social character of the millions who subsist by manual labor, whether they are engaged in manufactures or in agriculture?

What, then, says the honorable member for Oxfordshire? Take his statements to be correct; and they suggest matter for grave consideration. Here is a country in which wealth has increased—in which trade has increased—in which commodities have been cheapened; but, said the honorable gentleman—

—"the social condition of the people has not been raised; I have tried it by every test by which I can determine the fact, and the conclusion I come to is that it has not."

If that be so, is it not a formidable state of things? If increased wealth and enjoyment—if increased trade and cheaper commodities have not given the people more contentment, have not elevated them in the moral scale—if the moral and social improvement of those who form the foundation and platform of society has not advanced, is that not a subject of serious reflection?

He says:

"I look to the state of crime — it has increased: I look

to the great articles, not of consumption, but of luxury, which have become necessities: I look to sugar, to tea, and to other articles of a similar nature, and I find there has been no corresponding increase of consumption. . . . I draw my inferences from the facts and the statistics of the last thirty years."

Well, let us go back to the period at which the thirty years commence. That is the year 1815. Then began the present system of protection to agriculture.

You say you have carefully considered this state of things —that you have looked at them for the last thirty years; and you find increased wealth, increased trade, but a deteriorated condition of the people. With what do you compare the condition of the people for the last thirty years? With what preceding period do you institute the comparison?

Take any period of the last century. Let us exclude the war; because during the war which began in 1793 there was a great dislocation of capital and a great derangement of social interest. Our comparison, to take a period of peace similar to that of the last thirty years, must be a period which preceded the French war. We must go to the last century.

Take what period you please—take the period from 1700 down to 1791; and now let us compare what was the state of the law when the people, according to your showing, were in a more prosperous condition than during the last thirty years. Let us compare the state of the law at this period, or at any part of this period, with that when protection to agriculture began in 1815. Why, for the first sixty-six years of the last century there was no impediment to the importation of corn. For the first sixty-six years of that century this country was an exporting country. Let me ask you what were the agriculturists of Croatia and Hungary at that time about? Why did they not send us corn? This country was exporting corn

at that time—the price of corn was low and did not exceed 41*s*. What was the law passed in 1773? Why, foreign corn was admitted at a duty of 6*d*., when the price was above 49*s*. 6*d*.; and under that law, for six years after it was passed, this country was an exporting country. And did agriculture suffer during that period? Why, sir, there were more enclosure bills passed during that period, when there was a free importation of foreign corn—when it might be brought in at a duty of 6*d*. if the price exceeded 49*s*.—than ever before. There were not less than 1,600 enclosure bills passed. You say, then, that the condition of the people was comparatively better in point of morality and comfort than since 1815. In 1815, the commencement of the period of thirty years, this law was passed—that foreign corn should not be imported into England until after the price had arrived at 80*s*. There was a positive prohibition of foreign corn unless the price arrived at 80*s*. That was the perfection of protection.

Was that to continue? You relaxed it. In 1822 you permitted the importation of foreign corn when the price exceeded 70*s*. You altered this law again, which the honorable member for Newcastle-under-Lyme [Mr. Colquhoun] ranks with principles and ancient institutions. By the law of 1828 you subjected foreign corn when the price was under 64*s*. to a duty of 23*s*. 8*d*.; when it was at 69*s*. you subjected it to a duty of 16*s*. 8*d*.; and that law remained in force till 1842; and it was under the influence of this law, until you altered it in 1842, that you have the admission of the honorable gentleman the member for Oxfordshire, that the social and moral condition of the people has not improved.

What, also, did we in 1815? We imposed enormous duties and positive prohibitions upon other articles the produce of foreign countries. At that time the duty upon foreign butter

and cheese was 2*s.* 6*d.* and 1*s.* 6*d.* respectively; we raised it to £1 and 10*s.* 6*d.* Therefore we did in 1815 adopt the principle of strict protection to agriculture; and the honorable gentleman says that he finds crime increased, and the command over comforts and the moderate luxuries which partake of the nature of necessaries lessened. He says that is the result of the inspection of thirty years. So much, then, for the condition of the great body of the people.

Now I come to the facts of the honorable member for the North Riding of Yorkshire [Mr. E. S. Cayley]. I heard his speech; I was sorry to observe the indisposition under which he labored—an indisposition which in no degree prevented the exercise of his intellectual faculties or prevented him from speaking with his usual clearness and power.

I ask you to take the facts of the honorable gentleman since 1815. I am quoting the very expressions he used; the account I am giving of agriculture since that period is not mine, but his. I followed him closely, and took down his account of the condition of agriculture under a state of almost perfect protection. In 1815 you had prohibition of foreign importation till corn exceeded 80*s.*; and these are the historical annals of the honorable gentleman the advocate of agricultural protection. In 1816 and 1817, he says, you had severe distress. [Mr. Cayley.—In 1815 and 1816.]

I think it was after 1815 and 1816—I think it was in 1817—that a speech was made from the Throne lamenting the state of society and the efforts that were made by designing men to take advantage of the distress of the country. It was in 1817 that the Habeas Corpus Act was suspended, and the Seditious Meetings Bill was passed. In 1819, the honorable gentleman said, such was the severity of distress that the six acts were passed. In 1822, he said, agricultural distress was

so intense that a committee was appointed for the purpose of devising a remedy. He said that at that time the price of wheat — of beautiful wheat — was 40*s.*; that a farmer stated, I think, that where there were 150 persons usually out of employment, there were then 300; and that he had the greatest difficulty, on account of the low price of wheat, in giving employment to the agricultural laborers. From 1822 the honorable gentleman advanced to 1830, and he said that in 1830, on account of the depressed state of agriculture, we had the "Swing" fires.

In 1833 agriculture was again so depressed that it was necessary to appoint a committee to consider that distress and to attempt to devise a remedy. He said that there were thirty-five villages in the north of England with a population of 200,000 persons depending upon their labor, and their wages did not exceed 3*s.* 8½*d.* per week per man. In 1834, he said, the Preston operatives presented a petition to this House, in which they complained of poverty, of ignorance, and of vice. The year 1835, he said, was as bad as the year 1822, and prices were so low that the ordinary employment of agriculture could not be afforded. 1836 and 1837, he said, were years of sudden prosperity; but that came to an end in 1838, and there was prostration and suffering from 1839 to 1842.

That is the account which the honorable member gives of the state of agriculture under that protection which was terminated by the bill of 1842. Now, observe what the honorable member also said; he said that there was a constant alternation of high prices and of low prices; and he said, differing from many who concur with him in their vote, that the low prices, though caused by favorable harvests, entailed the greatest suffering upon the agricultural classes, and that

in 1822 and 1835 the farmer who had sold his wheat for less than 40*s*. complained, on account of the lowness of prices, that he could not give the usual employment. That lowness of price did not arise from competition with foreign corn; there was no foreign corn imported to reduce prices; that low price was caused by competition amongst the home growers of corn. There was a glut arising from productive harvests, there was no outlet for it, and there was prostration and suffering of the agriculturists in consequence.

That is the account which the honorable member gives of the result of high protection, not upon the manufacturing interest, but upon the agricultural; and when he had given that account—when he had detailed those sufferings on the part of the agriculturists, I was surprised to hear the honorable gentleman conclude with a quotation—

"Woodman, spare that tree!"

I beg pardon, I am afraid I should have to ask the honorable member to supply me with the verse, but the purport of it was that not a bough must be touched; that those whom it sheltered in youth ought to let it remain in their old age: after that account of the consequences of this high protection upon the agricultural interest I was surprised to hear that advice which the honorable gentleman gave us, not to touch a bough of that tree under the shade of which agriculture had so long flourished. If he had said—

"Ille et nefasto te posuit die,
. . . . .
—agro qui statuit meo
Te, triste lignum, te caducum
In domini caput immerentis"[1]—

I think it would have been a more appropriate quotation.

But now, is there no exception to be made from this period

[1] "He set thee out on an unfortunate day who placed thee, oh melancholy tree, oh frail tree, in my field at the head of my innocent master!"

of thirty years? Did nothing occur at the latter part of that period of thirty years to exempt it from the stigma which the honorable gentleman cast upon the preceding part? There have been three years—1843, 1844, and 1845—during which you have had, from some cause or other, the benefits of plenty and of cheapness.

During the last three of these thirty years the average price of wheat a little exceeded 50*s.*; and let us see whether during that period that censure will apply which applies to the former period—let us see whether, during the last three years, there has been no increase of comfort, no improvement in morality, no abatement of seditious feeling or disaffection. I care not what may be the cause of the abundance which has prevailed during the last three years; you say the cause is not to be attributed to the tariff, but that good harvests have produced abundance. Be it so. But there has been comparative abundance. There has been a less outlay required for the purchase of articles of first necessity.

You say there has been a demand for labor on railways. Why, that is an effect, and not a cause. It is on account of your prosperity that you are enabled to apply your capital to internal improvements, causing this demand for labor and giving increased wages; and do you believe, if wheat had been at 70*s.* instead of 50*s.*, there would have been the same stimulus to the application of capital?

But grant that the tariff of 1842 had nothing to do with the abatement of price in 1843, 1844, and 1845. I will concede it to you that it is attributable to the favor of Providence—to good harvests. But let us see what has been the result of this abundance. I will take the tests of the honorable gentleman. He says facts and figures show that there has been no increase of consumption. Now, I will

show that during the last three years trade has flourished, capital has accumulated; but that you cannot say of the last three years what you can say of the preceding twenty-seven years—that there has been a deterioration in the social condition of the people.

I will first take those articles which enter largely into consumption. I have here a statement of the quantities of certain articles entered for home consumption in the United Kingdom from 1839 to 1841, and from 1843 to 1846, showing the average quantity of each article in each of those periods. In the first three years, when the prices of provisions were high, the average consumption of sugar—for the three years ending in 1841—was 3,826,000 cwt.

The average consumption for the last three years ending the 1st of January, 1846, had increased from 3,826,000 cwt. to 4,346,000 cwt. The average consumption of tea in the first three years was 34,685,000 lbs. In the last three years it increased to 42,000,000 lbs. The average consumption of coffee during the first three years of high price was 27,941,000 lbs annually; the average consumption of the last three years was 31,883,000 lbs. The consumption of cocoa in the first three years averaged 1,859,000 lbs annually; in the last three years 2,575,000 lbs. Take another article, which, though in a smaller degree, enters largely into the consumption of the poor, and which is not a bad test of their comfort. During the first three years the consumption of currants averaged 175,000 cwt.; in the last three years it had increased to 280,000 cwt. I take then the tests of the honorable member for Oxfordshire—the consumption of articles necessary to the comfort of the people; and I show him that comparative plenty has produced this change in the command of the working classes over the smaller luxuries of life.

I will next come to a more important point—the state of crime. You have now an official record, presented within a few days, of what has been the state of crime in this country during the last thirty years. Now, what was the state of crime during the first period of twenty-seven years? From the first record in 1815 down to 1842, when the commitments attained the maximum number hitherto recorded, the increase in crime progressed from year to year until it had extended to above 600 per cent.

In 1843 a change commenced. In that year the number of commitments decreased. Within the last six years, three years of great increase of crime have been followed by three years during which the decrease was so considerable that the number of commitments in 1845 has been reduced to what it was seven years ago. In the three years of high prices this was the state of crime in each year: The number of commitments in the first year was 27,187; in the second, 27,760; and in the third, 31,309. During the last three years the number of commitments has been—in the first year, 29,591; in the second, 26,542; and in the third, 24,303.

Well, then, I take this other test of criminality and the extension of morality; and I ask whether we can resist the legitimate inference that the comparative cheapness and plenty which have existed during the last three years have had their effect in producing this diminished criminality?

The gentleman who drew up this return says: "The decrease of commitments in England" for the last three years "has therefore been general, continued, and extensive, to a degree of which there is no recorded example in this kingdom." He says again: "In the sixth class, containing those offences which do not fall within the definitions of the foregoing classes"—violence to the person and offences

against property—"there is a total absence of commitments for seditious riots or sedition."

A total absence of commitments for these offences! Why, can you have a stronger proof of the improvement of a country, apart from the command of comforts, than the fact that there should have been this progressive diminution in commitments and a total absence of any commitments for sedition or seditious riots? I say, therefore, comparing the result of the three years when we have had diminished protection to agriculture and a reduced price of provisions with the twenty-seven preceding years, the inference is just that the diminution of crime is attributable to an increased command over those articles which constitute the food of the people.

But you say, "As this happy state of things has arisen during the existence of the present corn laws—as the present corn laws have been coexistent with cheapness and plenty, on what principle do you seek to disturb this happy arrangement? You have proved that, coexistent with the corn laws, there have been cheapness and happiness; why, then, do you now come forward to propose their alteration?"

Why, if you can show me that those laws were the cause of this happiness and plenty, that would no doubt be a strong and powerful reason for their continuance. But it cannot be denied that, simultaneously with a reduced protection to agriculture, there has been not only no diminution in agricultural improvement, but increased exertions, an increased demand for agricultural products, and increased comfort for the people.

As you have proceeded downwards from 1815 to 1842, there has been a corresponding benefit from the abatement of protection. If we could anticipate that the law of 1842 would continue to produce all the advantages to which I have referred, that might be a conclusive reason for adhering to it.

But you assert that favorable harvests have occasioned these advantages. Why, what guarantee have you for the continuance of favorable harvests? You have had comparatively favorable harvests for the last three years; and you say then, as a matter of necessity, that we ought to continue this law. Continue the law, say I too, if you can prove that this particular law has been the cause of these benefits. If, however, you say that favorable harvests have been the cause, I say, then, that that does not constitute any reason for continuing the law.

Those who have observed attentively the vicissitudes of the seasons have remarked that there are cycles of favorable and unfavorable years. There was an unfavorable cycle of years in 1839, 1840, and 1841, during which time there was great distress. There has been since a favorable cycle of years, during which there has been comparative abundance. But supposing that this cycle of years in which we have had unfavorable harvests should again return, have we, I ask, any security that the law of 1842 will enable us to obtain an ample supply of food?

Suppose, also, that, coexistent with those unfavorable harvests, we had also a depressed state of manufactures—shall we then be in a favorable position for making any alteration in the law? Remember how short a time has elapsed since we had the state of Paisley, of Sheffield, and of Stockport, brought under our special notice. Now, if these times should again return, after this interval of comparative happiness, when the contrast of our misery will be considerably heightened by the preceding period of happiness which has prevailed, do you believe it would be possible to maintain in existence a law which leaves a duty of 16*s.* a quarter upon wheat when it had arrived at the price of 56*s.*?

You may say, "Disregard the progress of public opinion; defy the League; enter into a combination against it; determine to fight the battle of protection, and you will succeed."

My firm belief is—without yielding to the dictation of the League, or any other body—["Oh, oh!"]—yes, subjecting myself to that imputation, I will not hesitate to say my firm belief is that it is most consistent with prudence and good policy, most consistent with the real interests of the landed proprietors themselves, most consistent with the maintenance of a territorial aristocracy, seeing by how precarious a tenure, namely, the vicissitudes of seasons, you hold your present protective system—I say, it is my firm belief that it is for the advantage of all classes, in these times of comparative comfort and comparative calm, to anticipate the angry discussions which might arise, by proposing at once a final adjustment of this question.

I have stated the reasons which have induced me to take the present course. You may no doubt say that I am only going on the experience of three years and am acting contrary to the principles of my whole life. Well, I admit that charge—I admit that I have defended the existence of the corn laws—yes, and that up to the present period I have refused to acquiesce in the proposition to destroy them. I candidly admit all this; but when I am told that I am acting inconsistently with the principles of my whole life by advocating free trade, I give this statement a peremptory denial. During the last three years I have subjected myself to many taunts on this question, and you have often said to me that Earl Grey had found out something indicating a change in my opinions.

Did I not say I thought that we ought not hastily to disturb vested interests by any rash legislation? Did I not

declare that the principle of political economy suggested the purchasing in the cheapest market, and the selling in the dearest market? Did I not say that I thought there was nothing so special in the produce of agriculture that should exempt it from the application of this principle which we have applied already to other articles? You have a right, I admit, to taunt me with any change of opinion upon the corn laws; but when you say that by my adoption of the principle of free trade I have acted in contradiction to those principles which I have always avowed during my whole life, that charge, at least, I say, is destitute of foundation.

Sir, I will not enter at this late hour into the discussion of any other topic. I foresaw the consequences that have resulted from the measures which I thought it my duty to propose. We were charged with the heavy responsibility of taking security against a great calamity in Ireland. We did not act lightly. We did not form our opinion upon merely local information—the information of local authorities likely to be influenced by an undue alarm. Before I and those who agreed with me came to that conclusion, we had adopted every means—by local inquiry and by sending perfectly disinterested persons of authority to Ireland—to form a just and correct opinion. Whether we were mistaken or not—I believe we were not mistaken, but even if we were mistaken—a generous construction should be put upon the motives and conduct of those who are charged with the responsibility of protecting millions of the subjects of the Queen from the consequences of scarcity and famine.

Sir, whatever may be the result of these discussions, I feel severely the loss of the confidence of those from whom I heretofore received a most generous support. So far from expecting them, as some have said, to adopt my opinions, I perfectly

recognize the sincerity with which they adhere to their own. I recognize their perfect right, on account of the admitted failure of my speculation, to withdraw from me their confidence.

I honor their motives, but I claim, and I always will claim, while entrusted with such powers and subject to such responsibility as the minister of this great country is entrusted with and is subject to—I always will assert the right to give that advice which I conscientiously believe to be conducive to the general well-being. I was not considering, according to the language of the honorable member for Shrewsbury, what was the best bargain to make for a party. I was considering first what were the best measures to avert a great calamity, and, as a secondary consideration, to relieve that interest which I was bound to protect from the odium of refusing to acquiesce in measures which I thought to be necessary for the purpose of averting that calamity. Sir, I cannot charge myself or my colleagues with having been unfaithful to the trust committed to us. I do not believe that the great institutions of this country have suffered during our administration of power. The noble lord [Lord John Russell] says he hopes that the discussions which have threatened the maintenance of amicable relations with the United States will be brought to a fortunate close.

Sir, I think I can appeal to the course which we have pursued against some obloquy, some misconstruction, some insinuations that we were abandoning the honor of this country—I think I can appeal to the past experience of this government that it has been our earnest desire, by every effort consistent with the national honor, to maintain friendly relations with every country on the face of the globe.

This principle, so long as we are entrusted with the man-

agement of public affairs, will continue to influence us in respect to the settlement of our unfortunate differences with the United States.

Sir, if I look to the prerogative of the Crown—if I look to the position of the Church—if I look to the influence of the aristocracy—I cannot charge myself with having taken any course inconsistent with conservative principles, calculated to endanger the privileges of any branch of the legislature or of any institutions of the country. My earnest wish has been, during my tenure of power, to impress the people of this country with a belief that the legislature was animated by a sincere desire to frame its legislation upon the principles of equity and justice.

I have a strong belief that the greatest object which we or any other government can contemplate should be to elevate the social condition of that class of the people with whom we are brought into no direct relationship by the exercise of the elective franchise. I wish to convince them that our object has been to apportion taxation, that we shall relieve industry and labor from any undue burden, and transfer it, so far as is consistent with the public good, to those who are better enabled to bear it.

I look to the present peace of this country; I look to the absence of all disturbance—to the non-existence of any commitment for a seditious offence; I look to the calm that prevails in the public mind; I look to the absence of all disaffection; I look to the increased and growing public confidence on account of the course you have taken in relieving trade from restrictions, and industry from unjust burdens; and where there was dissatisfaction I see contentment; where there was turbulence I see there is peace; where there was disloyalty I see there is loyalty; I see a disposition to confide in you, and

not to agitate questions that are at the foundations of your institutions.

Deprive me of power to-morrow, you can never deprive me of the consciousness that I have exercised the powers committed to me from no corrupt or interested motives—from no desire to gratify ambition or attain any personal object; that I have labored to maintain peace abroad consistently with the national honor and defending every public right—to increase the confidence of the great body of the people in the justice of your decisions, and by the means of equal law to dispense with all coercive powers—to maintain loyalty to the Throne and attachment to the constitution, from a conviction of the benefit that will accrue to the great body of the people.

LAMARTINE

ALPHONSE MARIE LOUIS DE PRAT DE LAMARTINE, who was a statesman and orator as well as a poet and historian, was born at Mâcon in 1790. He was sent to school at Lyons in 1805, but soon afterward was transferred to the care of the *Pères de la Foi* at Belley, where he remained until 1809. In 1811 he went to Italy, where he sojourned about two years. In 1810–19 he revisited Italy, Savoy and Switzerland. In 1820 he published his first book, the "Meditations," which was exceedingly popular. In the same year he entered the diplomatic service, and continued in it until 1830, when he was elected a member of the Academy. He entered the Chamber of Deputies in 1834, and acquired a high reputation as an orator. When the Revolution of 1848 took place, he became a member of the provisional government, occupying the post of Minister for Foreign Affairs. He was elected to the new constituent assembly from ten different departments. To him mainly was due the quelling of the insurrection of May 15, 1848, but before the end of the year his influence over the people was extinguished, and in 1849 he failed even to be returned to the legislative assembly. During the last twenty years of his life he was in pecuniary straits, for his writings were no longer in demand, his reputation as a poet and historian having suffered an eclipse from which it has not yet recovered. He died in 1869.

THE REVOLUTION OF 1848

DELIVERED MAY 7, 1848, IN THE NATIONAL ASSEMBLY AT PARIS

CITIZEN-REPRESENTATIVES OF THE PEOPLE: At the moment of your entrance on the exercise of your sovereignty—at the moment of our resigning into your hands the special powers with which the Revolution provisionally invested us—we wish, in the first place, to render you an account of the situation in which we found ourselves, and in which you also find the nation.

A revolution burst forth on the twenty-fourth of February. The people overthrew the throne. They swore

upon its ruins thenceforth to reign alone, and entirely by themselves. They charged us to provide temporarily for the necessity of the interregnum which they had to traverse to reach, without disorder or anarchy, their unanimous and final power. Our first thought was to abridge this interregnum by immediately convoking the national representation, in which alone reside right and force. Simply, citizens, without any other summons than public peril, without any other title than our devotedness, trembling to accept, hastening to restore the deposit of national destinies, we have had but one ambition—that of resigning the dictatorship to the bosom of popular sovereignty.

The throne overturned, the dynasty crumbling of itself, we did not proclaim the Republic; it proclaimed itself, by the voice of an entire people—we did nothing but register the cry of the nation.

Our first thought, as well as the first requirement of the country, after the proclamation of the Republic, was the re-establishment of order and security in Paris. In this labor—which would have been more difficult and more meritorious at another time and in another country—we were aided by the concurrence of the citizens. While holding in one hand the musket which had just given the deathblow to royalty, this magnanimous people with the other raised up the vanquished and the wounded of the opposite party. They protected the life and property of the inhabitants. They preserved the public monuments. Each citizen of Paris was at once the soldier of liberty and the voluntary magistrate of order. History has recorded the innumerable acts of heroism, of probity, and disinterestedness, which have characterized these first

days of the Republic. Till this time the people had sometimes been flattered by allusions to their virtues; posterity, which is no flatterer, will find all these expressions beneath the dignity of the people of Paris in this crisis.

It was they who inspired us with the first decree destined to give its true signification to victory—the decree of the abolition of the penalty of death in political cases. They suggested, adopted, and ratified it, by the acclamation of two hundred thousand voices, on the square and quay of the Hôtel de Ville. Not a single exclamation of anger protested against it. France and Europe understood that God had his inspirations in the mass, and that a revolution inaugurated by grandeur of soul would be pure as an idea, magnanimous as a sentiment, and holy as a virtue.

The red flag, presented for a moment—not as a symbol of menace and disorder, but as a temporary flag of victory—was laid aside by the combatants themselves, to cover the Republic with that tricolored flag which had shaded its cradle, and led the glory of our arms over every continent and every ocean.

After having established the authority of government in Paris, it was necessary to make the Republic recognized in the departments, the colonies, in Algeria, and the army. The telegraphic news and couriers were enough. France, her colonies and armies, recognized their own idea in the idea of the Republic. There was no resistance from a single hand or voice, nor from one free heart in France, to the installation of the new government.

Our second thought was for the exterior. Europe awaited, in doubt, the first word from France. This first word was the abolition, in fact and right, of the reactionary treaties of 1815; the restoration of liberty to our foreign

policy; the declaration of peace to the territories; of sympathy to nations; of justice, loyalty, and moderation, to governments. France, in this manifesto, laid aside her ambition, but did not lay aside her ideas. She permitted her principle to shine out. This was all her warfare. The special report of the minister of foreign affairs will show you the fruits of this noonday system of diplomacy, and the legitimate and great fruits it must yield to the influences of France.

This policy required the minister of war to employ measures in harmony with the system of armed negotiation. He energetically re-established a discipline scarcely shaken, and honorably recalled to Paris the army, removed temporarily from our walls, that the people might have an opportunity of arming themselves. The people, henceforth invincible, did not delay summoning with loud cries their brethren of the army, not only as the safeguard, but as the ornament, of the capital. In Paris the army was only an honorary garrison, designed to prove to our brave soldiers that the capital of the country belongs to all her children.

We decreed, moreover, the formation of four armies of observation: the army of the Alps, the army of the Rhine, the army of the North, and the army of the Pyrenees.

Our navy—confided to the hands of the same minister, as a second army of France—was rallied under its commanders, in a discipline governed by a confidence in its vigilance. The fleet of Toulon sailed to display our colors to nations friendly to France on the shores of the Mediterranean.

The army of Algiers had neither an hour nor a thought of hesitation. The Republic and the country were united

in their view by a feeling of the same duty. A leader, whose republican name, sentiments, and talents, were at once pledges for the army and the revolution, General Cavaignac, received the command of Algeria.

The corruption which had penetrated the holiest institutions compelled the minister of war to adopt expurgations demanded by the public voice. It was necessary promptly to separate justice from policy. The minister made the separation with pain, but with inflexibility.

In proclaiming the Republic, the cry of France had not only proclaimed a form of government, but a principle. This principle was practical democracy, equality in rights, fraternity in institutions. The revolution accomplished by the people ought, according to us, to be organized for the profit of the people, by a series of fraternal and guardian institutions, proper to confer regularly on all the conditions of individual dignity, instruction, intelligence, wages, morality, the elements of labor, competence, aid, and advancement to property, which would suppress the servile name of proletary, and would elevate the laborer to the level of the rights, duties, and well-being of the firstborn of prosperity; to raise up and enrich the one, without debasing and degrading the other; to preserve property, and render it more prolific and sacred, by multiplying it and dividing it in the hands of the greatest number; distributing the taxes in such a manner as to make the burden fall heaviest on the strongest, by easing and succoring the weakest; to create by the state the labor which might accidentally fail, from the fact of the timidity of capital, so that there should not be a laborer in France whose bread and wages should fail him; and, finally, to study with the workmen themselves the practical and true

phenomena of association, and the yet problematical theories of systems, and to seek conscientiously their applications, and to ascertain their errors—such was the idea of the provisional government, in all the decrees; whose execution or examination it confided to the minister of finance, the minister of public works, and to the commissioner of the Luxembourg—the laboratory of ideas, the preparatory and statistical congress of labor and employment, enlightened by studious and intelligent delegates from all the laborious professions, presided over by two members of the Government itself.

The sudden fall of the monarchy, the disorder of the finances, the momentary displacement of an immense mass of factory laborers, the shocks which these masses of unoccupied arms might have given society, if their reason, their patience, and their practical resignation, had not been a miracle of popular reason, and the admiration of the world; the recoverable debt of nearly a thousand millions, which the fallen Government had accumulated on the first two months of the Republic; the industrial and commercial crisis universal on the continent and in England, coinciding with the political crisis in Paris; the enormous accumulation of railway shares and other fictitious property thrown into the hands of agents and bankers by the panic of capital; finally, the imagination of the country, which is carried beyond the truth at moments of political convulsion and social terror—had exhausted active capital, caused the disappearance of specie, and suspended free and voluntary labor, the only labor sufficient for thirty-five millions of men. It was necessary to supply it temporarily, or be false to all the principles, all the precautions, and all the necessities of the Republic that can be relieved. The

minister of finance will tell you how this prostration of labor and credit was provided for, while waiting for the moment now reached, when the restoration of confidence to men's minds would restore capital to the hands of manufacturers, and wages to labor; when your wisdom and national power will be equal to all difficulties.

The ministry of public instruction and worship, confided to the same hand, was for the Government a manifestation of intention, and for the country a presage of the new position which the Republic wished and ought to assume, under the twofold necessity of national enlightenment, and a more real independence of equal and free worship before conscience and the law.

The ministry of agriculture and commerce, a ministry foreign from its nature to politics, could only prepare with zeal, and sketch with sagacity, the new institutions summoned to fertilize the first of useful arts. It extended the hand of state over the suffering interests of commerce, which you alone can raise up by making them secure.

Such were our different and incessant cares. Thanks to that Providence, which has never more clearly manifested its intervention in the cause of nations and the human mind; thanks to the people themselves, who have never better shown the treasures of reason, civil virtue, generosity, patience, and morality—the true civilization which fifty years of imperfect liberty have elaborated in their hearts—we succeeded in accomplishing, very imperfectly without doubt, but yet not unhappily, a part of the immense and perilous task with which events had burdened us.

We have founded the Republic, a government declared impossible in France on any other conditions than foreign

war, civil war, anarchy, prisons, and the scaffold. We have displayed a Republic, happily compatible with European peace, with internal security, with voluntary order, with individual liberty, with the sweetness and amenity of manners of a nation for whom hatred is a punishment and harmony a national instinct.

We have promulgated the great principles of equality, fraternity, and unity, which must, in their daily development in our laws, enacted by all and for all, accomplish the unity of the people by the unity of representation.

We have rendered the right of citizenship universal, by rendering the right of election universal; and universal suffrage has responded to us.

We have armed the entire people in the National Guard, and the entire people have answered us by devoting the arms we confided to it to the unanimous defence of the nation, order, and law.

We have gone through the interregnum with no other executive force than the entirely unarmed moral authority, whose right the nation voluntarily recognized in us; and these people consented to suffer themselves to be governed by our words, our counsels, and their own generous inspirations.

We have passed more than two months of crisis, of cessation of labor, of misery, of elements of political agitation, of social sufferings and passions, accumulated in countless masses in a capital with a population of a million and a half, without property having been violated, without anger menacing a single life, without one repression, one proscription, one political imprisonment, without one drop of blood shed in our name, saddening the government in Paris. We can descend from this long dictatorship

to the public square, and mingle with the people without one citizen being able to ask: "What hast thou done with a citizen?"

Before summoning the National Assembly to Paris, we completely assured its security and independence by arming and organizing the National Guard, and giving you an entire armed people for your protection. There is no longer a possibility of faction in a Republic where there is no longer a division between enfranchised and disfranchised citizens, between armed and unarmed citizens. All have their rights, all have their army. In such a State insurrection is no longer the extreme right of resistance to oppression; it would be a crime. He who separates himself from the people is no longer of the people. This is the unanimity we have created; perpetuate it, for it is the common safety.

Citizen-representatives! our work is accomplished; yours now begins. Even the presentation of a plan of government, or a project of constitution, on our part, would have been a rash prolongation of power, or an infringement on your sovereignty. We disappear the moment you wish to receive the Republic from the hands of the people. We will only permit ourselves a single counsel and a single wish, in the name of our citizenship, and not as members of the provisional government. This wish, citizens, France utters with us; it is the voice of circumstance. Do not waste time, that precious element of human crises. After having absorbed the sovereignty in yourselves, do not suffer a new interregnum to clog the wheels of the country. Let not a commission of Government, springing from your body, allow power to fluctuate a single instant longer, precariously and provisionally, in a country which has

need of power and security. Let a committee on a constitution, emanating from your suffrages, report, without delay, for your deliberation and vote, the simple, brief, and democratic mechanism of a constitution whose organic and secondary laws you can afterward discuss at your leisure.

In the meanwhile, as members of the Government, we restore to you our powers.

We also confidently submit all our acts to your judgment, only we pray you to take into consideration the period and the difficulties. Our conscience reproaches us with nothing intentionally wrong. Providence has favored our efforts. Grant an amnesty to our involuntary dictatorship. We ask but to return to the ranks of good citizens.

Only may history record with indulgence, beneath and at a great distance from the great deeds achieved by France, the story of these three months, passed in the void between a fallen Monarchy and a Republic to be enthroned; and may it, instead of the obscure and forgotten names of men who devoted themselves to the common safety, inscribe on its pages two names only: the name of the people, who saved everything, and the name of God, who blessed everything, in the foundation of the Republic.

MANIFESTO TO EUROPE

MARCH 7, 1848

YOU have received intelligence of the events at Paris; of the victory of the people, their heroism, moderation, and tranquillity. Order has been established by the unanimous concurrence of the citizens, as if, during the interregnum of all visible powers, the general good sense of the community alone sufficed for the government of France.

The French revolution has thus just reached its definite period. France is a republic: the French republic does not require to be recognized to exist; it springs from a natural right, it is a national right. It is the will of a great nation, which only demands its title from itself. The French republic, however, desiring to enter into the family of the already instituted governments as a regular Power and not as a phenomenon that disturbs European order, it is requisite that you should promptly inform the government to which you are accredited of the principles and tendencies which will henceforth direct the external policy of the French government.

The proclamation of the French republic is not an act of aggression against any form of government in the world. Forms of government possess a diversity as legitimate as the diversity of character, of geographical situation, and of intellectual, moral, and material development among the nations. Nations, like individuals, have their different ages; the principles which govern them have successive phases. Monarchical, aristocratic, constitutional, and republican gov-

ernments are the expression of these different degrees of maturity in the genius of the people.

They demand more liberty in proportion as they feel themselves more capable of supporting it; they require more equality and democracy in proportion as they are more inspired with justice and love of the people. This is a question of time. A people lose themselves by anticipating this maturity, as they dishonor themselves by allowing it to escape without seizing it. Monarchy and republicanism are not, in the eyes of true statesmen, absolute principles which mortally oppose each other; they are facts which contrast with each other, and which may exist face to face, mutually comprehending and respecting each other.

War, then, is not the principle of the French revolution, as it became its glorious and fatal necessity in 1792. Between 1792 and 1848 there is half a century. To return after half a century to the principles of 1792, or to the principle of conquest of the empire, would not be to advance but to retrograde with regard to time. The revolution of yesterday is a step in advance, not in retreat; we desire that the world and ourselves should march to fraternity and to peace.

If the situation of the French republic in 1792 explained the necessity of war, the differences which exist between that epoch of our history and the one in which we now are explain the necessity of peace. These differences you must apply yourself to comprehend and to make them understood around you.

In 1792 the nation was not united. Two people existed upon the same territory. A terrible struggle was still prolonged between the classes dispossessed of their privileges and those which had just conquered equality and liberty. The

dispossessed classes united with captive royalty and with the jealous foreigner to refuse France its revolution and again to impose monarchy, aristocracy, and theocracy upon it by invasion. There are now no longer distinct and unequal classes. Liberty has enfranchised all. Equality has levelled everything in the eyes of the law. Fraternity, the application of which we proclaim, and the benefits of which the National Assembly will soon organize, is about to unite every one. There is not a single citizen in France, to whatever opinion he may belong, who does not rally round the principle of the country before everything, and who does not render her, by this union itself, impregnable against the attacks and alarms of invasion.

In 1792 it was not the entire people who had entered into possession of their government, it was the middling class only who desired to exercise liberty and to enjoy it. The triumph of the middle class was then egotistical, as is the triumph of every oligarchy. It desired to retain for itself alone the rights conquered by all. It behoved it, for this purpose, to operate a grand diversion to the accession of the people by precipitating them toward the field of battle to prevent them from taking possession of their own government. This diversion was war. War was the idea of the monarchists and of the Girondists; it was not that of the more enlightened democrats, who desired as we do the sincere, complete, and regular reign of the people themselves, comprehending, under that name, all classes, without exclusion and without preference, of which the nation is composed.

In 1792 the people were but the instruments of the revolution, they were not its object. To-day the revolution has been effected by the people and for them. In entering into it they bring to it their new cares of labor, industry, instruc-

tion, agriculture, commerce, morality, comfort, property, cheap living, navigation, and lastly, of civilization, which are all the necessities of peace! The people and peace are one and the same word.

In 1792 the ideas of France and of Europe were not prepared to comprehend and to accept the grand harmony of nations between themselves as a benefit to the human race. The thought of the past age existed only in the heads of a few philosophers. To-day philosophy is popular. Fifty years of liberty to think, to speak, and to write have produced their result. Books, journals, and legislative discussions have performed the apostleship of European intelligence. Reason, shining everywhere beyond the limits of nations, has created among their minds this grand intellectual nationality which will be the consummation of the French revolution, and the constitution of international fraternity all over the globe.

Lastly, in 1792, liberty was a novelty, equality a scandal, and the republic a problem. The rights of the people, scarcely discovered by Fénelon, Montesquieu, and Rousseau, were so forgotten, hidden, and profaned by the old feudal dynasty and sacerdotal traditions that the most legitimate interference of the people in their affairs appeared monstrous to statesmen of the old school. Democracy made thrones and the foundations of societies tremble at the same time. To-day thrones and nations are accustomed to the motto, to the forms, and to the regular agitations of liberty, exercised in diverse proportion in almost all states, even in those which are monarchical. They will habituate themselves to the republic which is its complete form among more matured nations. They will recognize that there is a conservative liberty; they will acknowledge that there can be found in

the republic, not only better order, but more true order in this government of all for all than in the government of a few for a few.

But exclusive of these disinterested considerations the interest alone of the consolidation and the duration of the republic would inspire the statesmen of France with thoughts of peace. It is not the country which runs the greatest danger in war, it is liberty. War is almost always a dictatorship,—soldiers forget institutions for men; thrones tempt the ambitions; glory dazzles patriotism. The prestige of a glorious name veils the design upon national sovereignty; the republic doubtless desires glory, but she desires it for herself and not for Cæsars or Napoleons.

Do not, however, deceive yourself; these ideas which the Provisional Government charge you to present to the Powers as a pledge for European security have not for their object to obtain the pardon of the republic for its audacity in daring to spring to life, still less to sue humbly for the position of a great right and a great people in Europe. They have a far more noble object: to make sovereigns and nations reflect; to prevent them from involuntarily deceiving themselves as to the character of our revolution; to bestow true light and a just appearance upon the event; to give, in short, some pledges to humanity before giving them to our rights and our honor if they were misunderstood or menaced.

The French republic, then, will not provoke war with any one; it has no need to say that it will accept it should conditions of war be imposed upon the French people. The idea of the men who govern France at present is this: That France will be fortunate if war should be declared against her, and if she be thus constrained to increase in power and glory in spite of her moderation! A terrible responsibility for France

if the republic itself declares war without being provoked to it. In the first case her martial genius, her impatience of action, and her force that has been augmented by so many years of peace, would render her invincible at home, dreaded, perhaps, beyond her frontiers. In the second case she would turn against herself the remembrance of her conquests, which alienates the affections of nations and compromises her first and most universal alliance—the spirit of the people and the genius of civilization.

After these principles, sir, which are the principles of France upon calm reflection,—principles which she can present without fear and without defiance to her friends and to her enemies,—you will do well to impress on your mind the following declarations:

The treaties of 1815 no longer exist as a right in the eyes of the French republic; nevertheless the territorial limits of these treaties form a fact which she admits as a basis and as a point of departure in her relations with other nations. But if the treaties of 1815 exist no longer save as facts to be modified by general agreement, and if the republic openly declares that it has the right and mission to attain regularly and pacifically these modifications, the good sense, the moderation, the conscience, and the prudence of the republic exist, and are for Europe a better and more honorable guarantee than the letters of those treaties which it has so often violated or modified.

Endeavor, sir, to cause this emancipation of the republic from the treaties of 1815 to be comprehended and admitted in good faith, and to show that this frank declaration possesses nothing inimical to the repose of Europe.

Thus we openly declare: If the hour of the reconstruction of certain oppressed nations in Europe or elsewhere should

appear to us to have sounded in the decrees of Providence; if Switzerland, our faithful ally since the time of Francis I, were constrained or threatened in the movement of aggrandizement which she is forming at home to lend further power to the fasces of democratic governments; if the independent states of Italy were invaded; if limits or obstacles were imposed upon their interior changes; if the right of uniting among themselves to consolidate an Italian country were contested by an armed hand,—the French republic would conceive itself entitled to arm itself to protect these legitimate movements of augmentation and of nationality among the nations.

The republic, you see, has passed at the first step the era of proscriptions and dictatorships. It has resolved never to conceal liberty at home. It has equally resolved never to veil its democratic principle abroad. It will allow no one to interfere between the pacific halo of its liberty and the regard of nations. It proclaims itself the intellectual and cordial ally of all the rights, of all the progress, and of all the legitimate developments of the institutions of nations who desire to live under the same principle as its own. It will make no secret propagation or incendiarism among its neighbors. It knows that no liberty is durable save that which is born upon its own grounds. But it will exercise by the light of its ideas and by the spectacle of the order and peace which it hopes to display to the world, the sole and honest proselytism—the proselytism of esteem and sympathy. This is not war; it is nature. It is not the agitation of Europe; it is life. It is not inflaming the world; it is shining from its place upon the horizon of nations, at once to precede and to guide them.

We desire for the sake of humanity that peace should be

preserved. We hope it also. One single question of war had been agitated a year ago between France and England. It was not republican France which started this warlike question; it was the dynasty. The dynasty bears with it that danger of war which it had occasioned in Europe by the wholly personal ambition of its family alliances in Spain. Thus this domestic policy of the fallen dynasty, which weighed for seventeen years upon our national dignity, weighed down at the same time, by its pretensions to another crown at Madrid, our liberal alliances and peace. The republic has no ambition. The republic has no nepotism. It does not inherit the pretensions of a family. Let Spain govern itself; let Spain be independent and free. France, for the soldiery of this natural alliance, relies more upon the conformity of principles than upon the successions of the house of Bourbon!

Such is, sir, the spirit of the council of the republic. Such will invariably be the character of the frank, firm, and moderate policy which you will have to represent.

The republic pronounced at its birth, and in the midst of the heat of a contest not provoked by the people, three words which have revealed its soul, and which will invoke upon its cradle the benedictions of God and of man,—Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity. She gave on the following day, by the abolition of death penalty in political matters, the true commentary of these three words at home. Give them also their true commentary abroad. The sense of these three words applied to our exterior relations is this: the enfranchisement of France from the chains which confined her principles and dignity; the recovery of the rank which she ought to occupy in the scale of the great European Powers; and, lastly, the declaration of alliance and friendship with all nations. If

France has the consciousness of her part in the liberal and civilizing mission of the age, there is not one of these words which signifies war. If Europe be prudent and just, there is not one word which does not betoken peace.

CONGRATULATORY SPEECH

[The following was a reply to the deputation of democrats from London, expressing the joy felt by all the English nation on learning that France had overthrown the monarchical government in order to found the republic on the basis of liberty, equality, and fraternity.]

AS Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Provisional Government of the Republic, and in the absence of our venerable president, I am charged to reply to your honorable deputation. But I do not need this title, for after the magnificent and pious language we have just heard there is no longer any other minister of foreign affairs than the sympathy between the two nations.

They will be for the future governed by their own feeling; and it is because they are governed by their own prudence and love for the human race that the peace of the world is assured. Royalty, which the people have abolished with so much glory and courage, has crushed in its fall all the prejudices which separated the nations.

Among this number—that which caused France and England the most regret, that which grieved the most all those sentiments of religion and humanity which will for the future be the policy of nations—was this international prejudice which forced us, as it were officially, to hate men for whom in our hearts we felt the strongest and warmest sympathy. This prejudice will not exist under the new republic.

Kings have jealousies and ambitions. Kings dispute and shed the blood of their subjects in disputing a fragment of territory to increase the lustre of their crowns; but the people have another ambition which does not cost mankind one drop of blood or a tear, and this is the ambition of the two people whom we have the glory of representing. From this day, when the republic receives from the English nation the most touching and spontaneous recognition, nothing prevents the fulfilment of the great idea of the French Revolution at its origin, that idea which sprang to light in France at the same moment with political liberty; nothing prevents its fulfilment. This idea is, as you well know, the honorable, indissoluble alliance of the two most civilized nations of the globe, for the purpose of assuring the peace of the Continent and putting an end to that bloodshed which has made a few men celebrated, but which is a disgrace to humanity.

I thank you, not only in the name of the French nation, but in the name of humanity, for the sentiments that pervade this address. We will have it translated and made known to all the citizens of the universe, and preserve it carefully in the archives of the republic amongst those titles which she will feel most pride in exhibiting to her descendants.

The names of the delegates of the great towns of England who have signed this address are a guarantee of the sympathy of the English people.

We should have felt that we had only acquired a selfish freedom if we had reserved its benefits for ourselves alone; we therefore hastened to proclaim liberty for all our brethren, and we rejoice to be in harmony on this occasion with the noble sentiments of England, who so long since freed all the blacks in her colonies. As soon as the Assembly meets she will confirm the principles proclaimed by us on the morrow of

our glorious revolution. We have only reserved one question —that of indemnity.

From "Three Months in Power."

REPLY TO CLUB DELEGATES

[In the following speech Lamartine demands, in the name of the people, the withdrawal of the troops, the postponement of the elections of the National Guard, and the postponement of the elections of the National Assembly.]

GENTLEMEN,—I have been called upon by my name, and I respond to the call and demand to be heard.

I shall add nothing to what our colleague, M. Louis Blanc, has just said with as much dignity as truth. You feel like us in whom the people have reposed their confidence and impersonified themselves on the day of their contest and victory, that there can be no government except on the condition of your possessing sufficient confidence and sufficient sense to invest this government with a moral authority. What is the moral authority of this government—not only in its own eyes, in those of the people, of the departments, of Europe—but its entire freedom from external influence and pressure? This is the independence of the government, its dignity, its sole moral force. Why are we here? Look around. Behold our venerable president, bowed down with the weight and glory of eighty years, and who has yet devoted his last years of life to establish a free, independent, dignified republic; and when we speak of liberty and independence who dare impugn the name of Dupont (de l'Eure)? Around us what do you behold? A small group of men, without arms, support, sol-

diers, or guards, who possess no other authority than what the people accord by respecting them, who seek no other, who mingle with the people from whom they have sprung, and who have only assumed so energetic and perilous a position in the republic to guarantee those popular interests which have hitherto been sacrificed beneath the monarchies, aristocracies, and oligarchies through which we have passed. But in order that this feeling may have its proper effect, in order that these popular principles may be usefully applied in promoting the happiness of people, what is needed? The peaceable continuation of this confidence you have given us. With what can we oppose you? With but one thing only—your own reason: that power of general reason which alone interposes between you and ourselves, which inspires us and restrains you. It is this invisible and yet all-powerful force which renders us calm and composed, independent and dignified, in the presence of the multitude that surrounds this palace of the people, which is only protected by its inviolability.

We will defend this last barrier of our inviolability with our lives, both as a government and as men, should the multitude seek to break it down; and it is not for ourselves, but for you, we would do so; for what would become of the people without a government, of what avail to the people would be a degraded government?

I come to the three demands you have made, a delay of ten days more in the elections of the National Guard.

We have already at a previous meeting felt it our duty to forestall alike the legitimate wishes of the people and your own request. It was represented to us that the imposing, solid, patriotic, and republican mass of the population which forms the immense popular element of Paris had not possibly

had sufficient time to enroll their names, and thus form a part of that large patriotic frame in which we desire to consolidate and fix the republic for the future. We had first adjourned the elections for a week, we have now done so until the 25th of March. I cannot give my unsupported opinion on the result of the fresh deliberation that may take place with respect to these measures; but you have a fortnight to enroll yourselves. As to the troops, I have already told one of the patriotic associations to which you belong, there are no troops at Paris except 1,500 or 2,000 men dispersed at the outposts for the protection of the gates and railroads; and it is utterly untrue that the government ever had the least design of summoning any to Paris. We must be mad, after what had passed,—after fallen royalty beheld 80,000 men fraternize with the people, did we dream of forcing on the people, with only a few scattered *corps d'armée* animated by the same republican spirit, measures at variance with your wishes and your independence. We never have entertained such an idea, we do not, we never shall. Such is the truth,—repeat it to the people; their liberty belongs to them because they have won it; it belongs to them because they will protect it from all outrage. The republic at home needs no other defenders than the armed people. But whatever may be the truth to-day—and although we declare that we only need the armed people to protect our institutions—do not conclude that we would ever consent to the humiliation of the French soldiers; do not conclude that we suspect our brave army or that we resign the right of summoning them to the interior, or even to Paris, did circumstances require such a disposition of our forces to ensure the safety of the country.

The soldier who yesterday was but a soldier is to-day a citizen like ourselves; and we have given him the privilege of

voting for the order and liberty which he will defend as effectually as any other member of the people.

Respecting the third and principal question—the prorogation to a remote period of the convocation of the National Assembly—I will not pledge the opinion of my colleagues, more especially my own, as to a measure which I think involves the interest of the country too deeply. Out of respect for our independence I will say nothing beforehand on a measure which would declare to the whole nation that Paris affects to monopolize liberty and the republic, and which would make us assume in the name of the capital alone and under the influence of a mass, well-intentioned but formidable from their very number, the dictatorship of that republic which was won by every one, but won for the whole of France and not for a few citizens.

If you bid me deliberate under menace, and declare beyond the pale of the law all the districts not at Paris,—declare them, during three or six months, deprived of their representative rights and their constitution,—I will say to you, as I did to another government, "You shall only tear this vote from my heart with the balls that have pierced it." No: deprive us a thousand times of our titles rather than of our unfettered opinions, our dignity, our unquestionable inviolability, as unquestionable abroad as at home. See your power in ours, your dignity in ours, your independence in ours, and suffer us for the very interest of the people to reflect and deliberate with calmness—to adopt or throw out those measures which you lay before us. We only—I only—promise to weigh them impartially in our conscience and to decide upon that which seems to us not only the desire of the Parisians, but the right and desire of the whole republic. I am convinced that the people are only here to support the Provisional Government, but the

nation may be deceived. Beware of meetings of this kind however glorious they may be. The 18th Brumaire of the people might cause the 18th Brumaire of despotism,—and this neither you nor I desire.

REPLY TO THE POLISH DEPUTATION

[Delivered in response to the demand for the assistance of the government in re-establishing Polish nationality.]

THE French republic accepts your adherence and your thanks for her hospitality as a happy omen. I need not tell you what are her feelings toward the sons of Poland, for the voice of France expressed them every year, even when this voice was restrained by a monarchy. The voice and gesture of the republic are more unfettered and more sympathetic; she will repeat these fraternal sentiments and prove them by every means compatible with the just, moderate, and peaceful policy that she has proclaimed to the world.

Yes, since your last disasters, since the sword has erased from the map of nations the last trace of your existence as a vestige and germ of a people, Poland has not only been the reproach, but a living remorse in the midst of Europe. France not only owes you good wishes and tears, but she owes you a moral and eventual assistance in return for the Polish blood with which you have bedewed every battle-field in Europe during our great wars.

France will pay her debt, rely on it; trust to the hearts of thirty-six millions of Frenchmen. Only leave to France that which exclusively pertains to her—the season, the moment, and the form, of which Providence shall determine the

choice and suitability, to restore you, without aggression or bloodshed, that place which is your due in the face of day and in the catalogue of nations.

You are acquainted with the principles which the Provisional Government of the republic has universally adopted in its foreign policy. In case you do not know them I will recapitulate them.

The republic is undoubtedly republican and she openly proclaims it to the world; but the republic is not at open or secret war with any nation or existing government so long as these nations and governments do not declare themselves at war with her.

She will not, therefore, commit or voluntarily suffer to be committed any act of violence or aggression against the Germanic nations. They, at this moment, are occupied in modifying their internal system of confederation and in assuring the security and right of those peoples who can claim a place amongst them. We should be either mad or traitors to the liberty of the world were we to interrupt this labor by warlike demonstrations and change into hostility, apprehension, or hatred the tendency to freedom that now makes them lean toward us and toward yourselves.

What a moment do you bid us choose for this measure, so utterly opposed to right policy and liberty! Is the treaty of Pilnitz being revived against us? Does the coalition of the despot monarchs now threaten our frontiers and yours? No. You see each courier brings us tidings of the victorious acclamation with which people adopt our principles, and strengthen our cause, precisely because we have declared that these principles were those of respect for the rights, the wishes, the forms, the government and territories, of nations. Are the results of the external policy of the government so

discouraging that we must compel them to change it by force and present ourselves on the frontiers with a sword instead of freedom and peace?

No; this policy, alike firm and pacific, answers the expectations of the republic too well for us to change it before the hour when the Powers shall change it of themselves. Look at Belgium; look at Switzerland, Italy, all the south of Germany; look at Vienna, Berlin; what more do you need? The very possessors of your territories open a path for you to your country and call on you to reconstitute them peacefully. Be not unjust toward God, toward the republic, or toward us. The nations sympathizing with Germany, the king of Prussia opening the gates of his fortresses to your martyrs, the gates of Poland opened, Cracow freed, the grand duchy of Posen again becomes a Polish province; such are the weapons with which one month of our policy has supplied you.

Ask no others at our hands. The Provisional Government will not suffer its policy to be changed by a foreign nation, however great the sympathy it may inspire. Poland is dear to us; Italy is dear to us; all oppressed peoples are dear to us; but France is dearer than all, and the responsibility of her destinies, and possibly those of Europe, rests with us, and we will surrender this responsibility to the nation alone. Trust to the nation; trust to the future; trust to those last thirty days which have already gained the cause of French democracy more ground than thirty pitched battles, and do not disturb by force of arms, or by an agitation which would only injure our common cause, the work which Providence accomplishes without other arms than its ideas for the regeneration of the people and the fraternity of the human race.

As Poles you have spoken admirably. As for us it is our

duty to speak as Frenchmen. We must both of us fulfil our respective duties. As Poles you are justly impatient to fly to the land of your fathers and to respond to the appeal which the already liberated portion of Poland has made to her generous sons. We can but applaud this sentiment and furnish, as you desire, all those pacific means which will aid the Poles in returning to their country, and rejoice at the commencement of independence at Posen.

We, as Frenchmen, have not to consider the interests of Poland alone; we have to consider the universality of that European policy which corresponds to all the horizons of France and all those interests of liberty of which the French republic is the second, and we trust the most glorious and the last, outbreak in Europe. The importance of these interests, the gravity of these resolutions, render it impossible for the Provisional Government of the republic to surrender into the hands of any partial nationality—any party in a nation, however sacred its cause be—the responsibility and freedom of its resolutions.

If the policy toward Poland, forced upon us under the monarchy, be no longer the line of policy dictated by the republic, the latter at least has spoken to the world in terms to which we will adhere: she will suffer no Power on the face of the earth to say to her, "Your words are different from your actions." The republic must and will not act in contradiction to her word; the respect paid it is purchased at this price, and she will never suffer it to fall into disrepute by falsifying it. What were her expressions in her manifesto to the Powers? Her thoughts were with you when she said, "The day when it shall seem to us that the moment has arrived for the resurrection of a nation unjustly effaced from the map, we will hasten to its assistance." But we have

reserved to ourselves that which pertains to France alone,—the choice of the time, justice, cause, and reasons which would make it our duty to interfere.

Well, up to this moment we have chosen and resolved that these means should be pacification. See yourselves, and let France and Europe see, if these pacific means have deceived us or deceived you.

In thirty-one days the natural and peaceful results of this system of peace and fraternity which we have declared we would adopt toward people and governments have proved of more avail to the cause of France, liberty, and Poland herself than ten battles and torrents of human blood.

Vienna, Berlin, Italy, Milan, Genoa, Southern Germany, Munich, all these constitutions, all these spontaneous outbreaks of the people, your own frontiers opened to you amid the acclamations of Germany, who reconstitutes herself amid the inviolability with which we invest her territories and government.

Such is the progress of the republic, thanks to this system of respect for the freedom of the land and the blood of mankind. We shall never retreat into another system. The straight path, rest assured, will lead us to that disinterested object we seek to attain far better than the tortuous paths of diplomacy. Do not seek to induce us to deviate from it even through the fraternal sentiments we entertain toward you. Our reason restrains and guides our feelings toward Poland. Suffer us to listen to the promptings of this sentiment in the full freedom of our thoughts, and learn that these thoughts do not separate two people whose blood has so often mingled on the battle plain. Our care for you, like our hospitality, shall extend to your own frontiers; our eyes shall follow you into your own country. Bear thither with you

the hope of that regeneration which commences for you in Prussia, where your banner floats at Berlin. France asks no other return for the asylum she has afforded you than the amelioration of your national destinies and the recollections you will carry with you of the French name.

Do not forget that it is to the republic that you owe the first step you are about to make toward your country.

BERRYER

PIERRE ANTOINE BERRYER was born at Paris, January 4, 1790. He was educated at the Collège de Juilly. He took up the study of law, and was admitted to practice in 1811. In the conflict between Napoleon and the Bourbons Berryer showed himself an ardent Legitimist, and, in the spring of 1815, at the opening of the campaign of the Hundred Days, he followed Louis XVIII. to Ghent as a volunteer. After the Second Restoration, he engaged in the unsuccessful defence of Marshal Ney before the Chamber of Peers. In 1830 Berryer was elected member of the Chamber of Deputies. After the Revolution of July 3, 1830, the Legitimists withdrew in a body, Berryer alone retaining his seat, and, though a friend of the deposed king, remaining non-partisan. In May, 1832, he hastened from Paris to dissuade the Duchess of Berri, who had landed in the south of France with her son, the Duke of Bordeaux, from organizing an insurrection. Failing in this, he set out for Switzerland. Though later arrested and brought to trial as one of the insurgents, he was acquitted. In the following year he pleaded for the liberation of the Duchess, and made a speech in defence of Chateaubriand, who was prosecuted for his attacks on the government of Louis Philippe. Among the noteworthy events of his subsequent career were his defence of Louis Napoleon after the affair of Boulogne in 1840 and a visit to England in 1843 for the purpose of formally acknowledging the Duke of Bordeaux as the lawful king of France. Berryer was an active member of the National Assembly, convoked after the Revolution of February, 1848. His parliamentary career was temporarily closed by a protest against the *coup d'état* of December 2, 1851. After a lapse of twelve years, he reappeared as a Deputy to the Corps Législatif. In the meantime, he had occupied himself in attempting to promote a fusion of the two branches of the Bourbon family, and had made speeches at the trial of Montalembert in 1858 and in the civil proceedings against Jerome Bonaparte in 1860. Berryer was elected a member of the French Academy in 1854. In 1865 he paid a visit to Lord Brougham and was received with honor in England. He died at his country seat in Augerville on the 29th of November, 1868.

CENSORSHIP OF THE PRESS

DELIVERED FEBRUARY 15, 1868

I HAVE but few words to say in presenting a brief amendment to the press law now under discussion. This paragraph was suggested to me by the grave circumstances now existing which have a profound influence on private rights.

The principle of the matter now under consideration is this: Private life should be walled in and sacred, but public life has no such right. All public existence created by great public interests and all variations of these interests create a responsibility, and this responsibility is moral as well as material. There is no gainsaying this, and all public functionaries admit they are responsible for their personal actions. But in opposition to them we find a body of men occupying an anomalous position. Immense establishments have been founded, which have attained such exaggerated proportions in their influence on public and private life that the men responsible for their direction are more powerful than even public characters. I speak particularly of the directors of the great corporate companies and financial institutions who are irresponsible, or at least their acts are impersonal and official and free from direct responsibility.

What have we seen and what do we still see? A large number of such establishments are founded; they develop and some crumble. Values or their equivalents have been emitted by these concerns under the direction of men re-

sponsible for nothing. They are issued in enormous proportions up to the hundreds of millions, even to the billion mark. What is the character of many of these values created by establishments calling themselves French? What social, business, and political calamities have resulted? You have seen shares issued at five hundred francs sold for one thousand nine hundred francs and then fall, carrying ruin to the citizens to whom they had been transferred under the faith of the government, since the authorization of the government was necessary to the foundation of such establishments. And have any of them a censor placed near or over them? There should be rigorous censorship over all stock companies. They are freed from all supervision now, and I believe it an error. Well, I ask when private fortune in such colossal proportions is exposed to disaster: Is this not a public danger? Is it not for the general interest that the actions of such societies, the commerce of their directors and administrators, should be called to public attention, that every one may know what is occurring?

If, in reviewing the deeds of these gentlemen, we find that these deeds are criminal in character, and worthy of condemnation, is it well that the publisher of such news to the public should be prosecuted for defamation, because he makes known to his fellow-citizens fraudulent manœuvres and irregular operations, when in so doing he acts from an evident general interest of honesty against men who have in their hands the fate of interests so vast that it is really the cause of administrative justice to make public the lies, falsities, and perils which are evident in much of the certificate values in circulation? The Lord knows how, when one has had the courage to say, "Here are their prac-

tices, here are the secret acts, here is what menaces you," shall he be censured and punished for defamation as having brought disgrace to or soiled the dignity of such corporate administrators. I repeat that the proof of facts which interest private fortunes in such degree may be said to be public facts, and their free publication should be authorized. With this view I present the amendment to make such officials subject to the press censures applicable to political and public functionaries.

RICHARD SHEIL

RICHARD LALOR SHEIL was born in 1791 at Drumdowney, Tipperary. He was taught French and Latin by a French refugee priest, and was afterward sent to Kensington House School, London, which was presided over by the Prince de Broglie. In 1804 he was removed to the Jesuit College at Stonyhurst, Lancashire, and three years later entered Trinity College, Dublin, where he took his B.A. degree in 1811. In the same year he entered Lincoln's Inn, and was called to the Irish bar in 1814. While awaiting clients he supported himself by writing plays. One of his pieces, "Adelaide, or the Emigrants," was produced at Dublin, in 1814, with complete success, and two years later was performed in London at Covent Garden. "The Apostate," brought out at the latter theatre in 1817, established Sheil's reputation, and encouraged him to pursue the vocation of a dramatist until his legal and political duties absorbed his time. His principal other plays were "Bellamira," "Evadne," "Huguenot," and "Montini." Along with O'Connell he was the principal leader of the agitation persistently carried on until Catholic emancipation was granted in 1829. In the same year he was returned to the House of Commons, and thereafter took a conspicuous part in all the debates relating to Ireland. His brilliant eloquence captivated the admiration of the House. In August, 1839, he became Vice-President of the Board of Trade in Lord Melbourne's administration, and, after the accession of Lord John Russell to power, in 1846, he was made Master of the Mint. In 1850 he was appointed Minister at the Court of Tuscany. He died at Florence in the following year.

IN DEFENCE OF IRISH CATHOLICS

FROM A SPEECH DELIVERED IN 1828

CALUMNIATORS of Catholicism, have you read the history of your country? Of the charges against the religion of Ireland, the annals of England afford the confutation. The body of your common law was given by the Catholic Alfred. He gave you your judges, your magistrates, your high sheriffs, your courts

of justice, your elective system, and, the great bulwark of your liberties, the trial by jury. Who conferred upon the people the right of self-taxation, and fixed, if he did not create, their representation? The Catholic Edward I.; while, in the reign of Edward III., perfection was given to the representative system, parliaments were annually called, and the statute against constructive treason was enacted. It is false—foully, infamously false—that the Catholic religion, the religion of your forefathers, the religion of seven millions of your fellow-subjects, has been the auxiliary of debasement, and that to its influence the suppression of British freedom can, in a single instance, be referred. I am loth to say that which can give you cause to take offence; but, when the faith of my country is made the object of imputation, I cannot help, I cannot refrain, from breaking into a retaliatory interrogation, and from asking whether the overthrow of the old religion of England was not effected by a tyrant, with a hand of iron and a heart of stone—whether Henry did not trample upon freedom, while upon Catholicism he set his foot; and whether Elizabeth herself, the virgin of the Reformation, did not inherit her despotism with her creed; whether in her reign the most barbarous atrocities were not committed —whether torture, in violation of the Catholic common law of England, was not politically inflicted, and with the shrieks of agony the Towers of Julius, in the dead of night, did not reëcho.

You may suggest to me that in the larger portion of Catholic Europe freedom does not exist; but you should bear in mind that, at a period when the Catholic religion was in its most palmy state, freedom flourished in the countries in which it is now extinct. False—I repeat it,

with all the vehemence of indignant asseveration—utterly false is the charge habitually preferred against the religion which Englishmen have laden with penalties and have marked with degradation. I can bear with any other charge but this—to any other charge I can listen with endurance. Tell me that I prostrate myself before a sculptured marble; tell me that to a canvas glowing with the imagery of heaven I bend my knee; tell me that my faith is my perdition—and, as you traverse the churchyards in which your forefathers are buried, pronounce upon those who have lain there for many hundred years a fearful and appalling sentence—yes, call what I regard as the truth, not only an error, but a sin, to which mercy shall not be extended—all this I will bear—to all this I will submit—nay, at all this I will but smile—but do not tell me that I am in heart and creed a slave!—That, my countrymen cannot brook! In their own bosoms they carry the high consciousness that never was imputation more foully false, or more detestably calumnious!

ON THE JEWISH DISABILITIES BILL

[From the time of Mr. Robert Grant's motion for the admission of Jews to Parliament, April 5, 1830, bills to this end were repeatedly brought in and occasionally passed by the Commons but always thrown out by the Lords. The election of Baron Rothschild for the city of London in 1847 added a new zest to Jewish Emancipation. It was not, however, until 1858 that the Jewish Disabilities were entirely removed. The following speech was delivered in the House of Commons February 7, 1848.]

SIR,—If the honorable the learned and exceedingly able gentleman who has just sat down [Mr. Walpole] had been a member of the House of Commons when the member for Tamworth brought forward the measure of Emancipation, the speech which he has this night pronounced

against the Jews would have been fully as apposite upon that great historical occasion. With all his habits of fine forensic discrimination I do not think that he can distinguish between the objections urged against the Catholic and against the Jew. He has, for example, strenuously insisted that in the writ by which the sheriff is commanded to hold an election a reference is made to the maintenance of the Anglican Church. That objection is nearly as strong when applied to the Unitarian, the Baptist, the Independent, and, above all, to the professors of the religion to which it is my good fortune to belong. That men subject to all the duties should be deemed unworthy of the rights of Englishmen appears to me to be a remarkable anomaly. The enjoyment of rights ought not to be dissociated from the liabilities to duties. A British subject ought in every regard to be considered a British citizen; and inasmuch as the professors of the most ancient religion in the world, which, as far as it goes, we not only admit to be true, but hold to be the foundation of our own, are bound to the performance of every duty which attaches to a British subject, to a full fruition of every right which belongs to a British citizen, they have, I think, an irrefragable title. A Jew born in England cannot transfer his allegiance from his sovereign and his country; if he were to enter the service of a foreign power engaged in hostilities with England and were taken in arms he would be accounted a traitor. Is a Jew an Englishman for no other purposes than those of condemnation? I am not aware of a single obligation to which other Englishmen are liable from which a Jew is exempt; and if his religion confers on him no sort of immunity it ought not to affect him with any kind of disqualification.

It has been said in the course of these discussions that a Jew is not subject to penalties, but to privations. But what is

privation but a synonym for penalty? Privation of life, privation of liberty, privation of property, privation of country, privation of right, privation of privilege—these are degrees widely distant indeed, but still degrees in the graduated scale of persecution. The parliamentary disability that affects the Jew has been designated in the course of these debates by the mollified expressions to which men who impart euphemism to severity are in the habit of resorting; but most assuredly an exclusion from the House of Commons ought in the House of Commons itself to be regarded as a most grievous detriment. With the dignity and the greatness and the power of this, the first assembly in the world, the hardship of exclusion is commensurate. Some of the most prominent opponents of this measure are among the last by whom a seat in Parliament ought to be held in little account. On this branch of the case —the hardship of an exclusion from this House—I can speak as a witness as well as an advocate. I belong to that great and powerful community which was a few years ago subject to the same disqualification that affects the Jew, and I felt that disqualification to be most degrading. Of myself I will not speak, because I can speak of the most illustrious person by whom that community was adorned. I have sat under the gallery of the House of Commons by the side of Mr. O'Connell during a great discussion on which the destiny of Ireland was dependent. I was with him when Plunket convinced, and Brougham surprised, and Canning charmed, and Peel instructed, and Russell exalted and improved. How have I seen him repine at his exclusion from the field of high intellectual encounter in those lists in which so many competitors for glory were engaged, and into which, with an injurious tardiness, he was afterwards admitted! How have I seen him chafe the chain which bound him down, but which, with an

effort of gigantic prowess, he burst at last to pieces! He was at the head of millions of an organized and indissoluble people. The Jew comes here with no other arguments than those which reason and truth supply; but reason and truth are of counsel with him; and in this assembly, which I believe to represent not only the high intelligence but the high-mindedness of England, reason will not long be baffled, and truth, in fufilment of its great aphorism, will at last prevail.

I will assume that the exclusion from this House is a great privation, and I proceed to consider whether it be not a great wrong. Nothing but necessity could afford its justification; and of this plea we should be taught, by a phrase which has almost grown proverbial, to beware. Cardinal Caraffa relied upon necessity when he founded that celebrated tribunal whose practices are denounced by you, but upon whose maxims have a care lest you should unconsciously proceed. The sophistications of intolerance are refuted by their inconsistencies. If a Jew can choose, wherefore should he not be chosen? If a Jew can vote for a Christian, why should not a Christian vote for a Jew? Again, the Jew is admissible to the highest municipal employments; a Jew can be high sheriff— in other words, he can impanel the jury by which the first Christian commoner in England may be tried for his life. But if necessity is to be pleaded as a justification for the exclusion of the Jew it must be founded on some great peril which would arise from his admission. What is it you fear? What is the origin of this Hebrewphobia? Do you tremble for the Church? The Church has something perhaps to fear from eight millions of Catholics and from three millions of Methodists and more than a million of Scotch seceders. The Church may have something to fear from the assault of sectaries from without, and still more to fear from a sort of spurious Popery and the

machinations of mitred mutiny from within; but from the Synagogue—the neutral, impartial, apathetic, and unproselytizing Synagogue—the Church has nothing to apprehend. But it is said that the House will become unchristianized. The Christianity of the Parliament depends on the Christianity of the country; and the Christianity of the country is fixed in the faith and inseparably intertwined with the affections of the people. It is as stable as England herself, and as long as Parliament shall endure, while the constitution shall stand, until the great mirror of the nation's mind shall have been shattered to pieces, the religious feelings of the country will be faithfully reflected here. This is a security far better than can be supplied by a test which presents a barrier to an honest Jew, but which a scornful skeptic can so readily and so disdainfully overleap.

Reference has been made in the course of these discussions to the author of "The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire." A name still more illustrious might have been cited. Was not the famous St. John—was not Bolingbroke, the fatally accomplished, the admiration of the admirable, to whom genius paid an almost idolatrous homage, and by whom a sort of fascination was exercised over all those who had the misfortune to approach him—was not the unhappy skeptic, by whom far more mischief to religion and morality must have been done than could be effected by half a hundred of the men by whom the Old Testament is exclusively received, a member of this House? Was he stopped by the test that arrests the Jew; or did he not trample upon it and ascend through this House to a sort of masterdom in England and become the confidential and favorite adviser of his sovereign? He was not only an avowed and ostentatious infidel, but he was swayed by a distempered and almost insane solicitude for

the dissemination of his disastrous disbelief. Is it not then preposterous that a man by whom all revealed religion is repudiated, who doubts the immortality of the soul, doubts a future state of rewards and punishments, doubts in a superintending Providence, believes in nothing, fears nothing, and hopes for nothing, without any incentive to virtue, and without any restraint upon depravity excepting such as a sense of conventional honor or the promptings of a natural goodness may have given him—is it not, I say, preposterous, and almost monstrous, that such a man, for whom a crown of deadly nightshade should be woven, should be enabled, by playing the imposture of a moment and uttering a valueless formula at the table of the House, to climb to the pinnacle of power; and that you should slap the doors of this House with indignity upon a conscientious man who adheres to the faith in which he was born and bred; who believes in the great facts that constitute the foundation of Christianity; who believes in the perpetual existence of the nobler portion of our being; who believes in future retribution and in recompense to come; who believes that the world is taken care of by its almighty and everlasting Author; who believes in the mercy of God and practises humanity to man; who fulfils the ten great injunctions in which all morality is comprised; whose ear was never deaf to the supplications of the suffering; whose hand is as open as day to charity; and whose life presents an exemplification of the precepts of the Gospel far more faithful than that of many a man by whom, in the name of the Gospel, his dishonoring and unchristian disabilities are most wantonly, most injuriously, and most opprobriously maintained? But where in the Scripture—in what chapter, in what text, in what single phrase—will you find an authority for resorting to the infliction of temporal penalty, or of temporal privation of any kind,

as a means of propagating heavenly truth? You may find an authority, indeed, in the writings of jurists and of divines, and in the stern theology of those austere and haughty churchmen by whom the Pharisaical succession, far better than the Apostolical, is personally and demonstratively proved. But you will not find it in the New Testament; you will not find it in Matthew, nor in Mark, nor in Luke, nor in John, nor in the epistles of the meek and humble men to whom the teaching of all nations was given in charge; above all, you will not find in it anything that was ever said, or anything that was ever done, or anything that was ever suffered, by the Divine Author of the Christian religion, who spoke the Sermon on the Mountain, who said that the merciful should be blessed, and who, instead of ratifying the anathema which the people of Jerusalem had invoked upon themselves, prayed for forgiveness for those who knew not what they did in consummating the Sacrifice that was offered up for the transgressions of the world.

It was not by persecution, but despite of it—despite of imprisonment, and exile, and spoliation, and shame, and death, despite the dungeon, the wheel, the bed of steel, and the couch of fire—that the Christian religion made its irresistible and superhuman way. And is it not repugnant to common reason, as well as to the elementary principles of Christianity itself, to hold that it is to be maintained by means diametrically the reverse of those by which it was propagated and diffused? But, alas! for our frail and fragile nature, no sooner had the professors of Christianity become the copartners of secular authority than the severities were resorted to which their persecuted predecessors had endured. The Jew was selected as an object of special and peculiar infliction. The history of that most unhappy people is, for century after century, a trail of chains and a track of blood. Men of mercy

occasionally arose to interpose in their behalf. St. Bernard—the Great St. Bernard, the last of the Latin Fathers—with a most pathetic eloquence took their part. But the light that gleamed from the ancient turrets of the Abbey of Clairvaux was transitory and evanescent. New centuries of persecution followed; the Reformation did nothing for the Jew. The infallibility of Geneva was sterner than the infallibility of Rome. But all of us,—Calvinists, Protestants, Catholics,—all of us who have torn the seamless garment into pieces have sinned most fearfully in this terrible regard.

It is, however, some consolation to know that in Roman Catholic countries expiation of this guilt has commenced. In France and in Belgium all civil distinction between the Protestant and the Jew is at an end. To this Protestant country a great example will not have been vainly given. There did exist in England a vast mass of prejudice upon this question, which is, however, rapidly giving way. London, the point of imperial centralization, has made a noble manifestation of its will. London has advisedly, deliberately, and with benevolence aforethought selected the most prominent member of the Jewish community as its representative and united him with the first minister of the Crown. Is the Parliament prepared to fling back the Jew upon the people in order that the people should fling back the Jew upon the Parliament? That will be a dismal game, in the deprecation of whose folly and whose evils the Christian and the statesman should concur. But not only are the disabilities which it is the object of this measure to repeal at variance with genuine Christianity, but I do not hesitate to assert that they operate as impediments to the conversion of the Jews and are productive of consequences directly the reverse of those for which they were originally designed. Those disabilities are not sufficiently onerous to be compul-

sory, but they are sufficiently vexatious to make conversion a synonym for apostacy and to affix a stigma to an interested conformity with the religion of the State. We have relieved the Jew from the ponderous mass of fetters that bound him by the neck and by the feet; but the lines which we have left, apparently light, are strong enough to attach him to his creed and make it a point of honor that he should not desert it.

There exists in this country a most laudable anxiety for the conversion of the Jews. Meetings are held and money is largely subscribed for the purpose; but all these creditable endeavors will be ineffectual unless we make a restitution of his birthright to every Englishman who professes the Jewish religion. I know that there are those who think that there is no such thing as an English, or a French, or a Spanish Jew. A Jew is but a Jew; his nationality, it is said, is engrossed by the hand of recollection and of hope, and the house of Jacob must remain forever in a state of isolation among the strange people by whom it is encompassed. In answer to these sophistries I appeal to human nature. It is not wonderful that when the Jew was oppressed and pillaged and branded in a captivity worse than Babylonian, he should have felt upon the banks of the Thames, or of the Seine, or the Danube, as his forefathers felt by the waters of the Euphrates, and that the psalm of exile should have found an echo in his heart. This is not strange; it would have been strange if it had been otherwise; but justice—even partial justice—has already operated a salutary change.

In the same manner in which we have relaxed the laws against the Jews, that patriot instinct by which we are taught to love the land of our birth has been revived. British feeling has already taken root in the heart of the Jew, and for its perfect development nothing but perfect justice is required.

To the fallacies of fanaticism give no heed. Emancipate the Jew—from the statute-book of England be the last remnant of intolerance erased forever; abolish all civil discriminations between the Christian and the Jew, fill his whole heart with the consciousness of country. Do this, and we dare be sworn that he will think and feel and fear and hope as you do; his sorrow and his exultation will be the same; at the tidings of English glory his heart will beat with a kindred palpitation; and whenever there shall be need, in the defence of his sovereign and of his country, his best blood, at your bidding, will be poured out with the same heroic prodigality as your own.

BUCHANAN

JAMES BUCHANAN was the son of an Irishman, who emigrated from Donegal, Ireland, to Pennsylvania, and who there became a well-to-do farmer. James was born in Franklin County, Pennsylvania, in 1791. He took a B.A. degree at Dickinson College, Carlisle, in 1809, and was admitted to the bar three years later. He soon acquired at Lancaster a lucrative practice. In his early life he was a zealous Federalist, and, as such, was elected in 1814, and again in 1815, to the State Legislature. In 1820 he became a member of Congress. In 1828 he supported General Jackson at the Presidential election, and in the following year succeeded Daniel Webster as head of the Judiciary Committee of the House. On completing his fifth term in 1831, Buchanan retired from the House of Representatives, and the next year was appointed Minister to the Court of Russia. On his return to the United States, he was elected a United States Senator, and retained his seat until 1845, when he was appointed Secretary of State under President Polk. At the close of his term of office in March, 1849, he retired into private life, but four years later he accepted from President Pierce the post of United States Minister to Great Britain. In 1854 he was the originator of the so-called Ostend Conference, called for the purpose of furthering the acquisition of Cuba by the United States. He returned from England in 1856, and the same year was elected as the Democratic candidate to the Presidential chair. During his administration he gave his support to the pro-slavery party, and dissensions grew to such an extent that disruption and war between the North and the South followed the election of his successor. From the date of his withdrawal from the White House in March, 1861, he led a retired life and died at his estate of Wheatland in Pennsylvania, on June 1, 1868.

INAUGURAL ADDRESS

Fellow-Citizens:

I APPEAR before you this day to take the solemn oath "that I will faithfully execute the office of President of the United States and will to the best of my ability preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States."

In entering upon this great office I must humbly invoke the God of our fathers for wisdom and firmness to execute its high and responsible duties in such a manner as to restore harmony and ancient friendship among the people of the several States, and to preserve our free institutions throughout many generations. Convinced that I owe my election to the inherent love for the Constitution and the Union which still animates the hearts of the American people, let me earnestly ask their powerful support in sustaining all just measures calculated to perpetuate these, the richest political blessings which Heaven has ever bestowed upon any nation. Having determined not to become a candidate for re-election, I shall have no motive to influence my conduct in administering the government, except the desire ably and faithfully to serve my country and to live in the grateful memory of my countrymen.

We have recently passed through a Presidential contest in which the passions of our fellow-citizens were excited to the highest degree by questions of deep and vital importance; but when the people proclaimed their will the tempest at once subsided and all was calm.

The voice of the majority, speaking in the manner prescribed by the Constitution, was heard, and instant submission followed. Our own country could alone have exhibited so grand and striking a spectacle of the capacity of man for self-government.

What a happy conception, then, was it for Congress to apply this simple rule, that the will of the majority shall govern, to the settlement of the question of domestic slavery in the Territories! Congress is neither "to legislate slavery into any Territory or State, nor to exclude it therefrom, but to leave the people thereof perfectly free to

form and regulate their domestic institutions in their own way, subject only to the Constitution of the United States."

As a natural consequence, Congress has also prescribed that when the Territory of Kansas shall be admitted as a State it "shall be received into the Union with or without slavery, as their Constitution may prescribe at the time of their admission."

A difference of opinion has arisen in regard to the point of time when the people of a Territory shall decide this question for themselves.

This is, happily, a matter of but little practical importance. Besides, it is a judicial question, which legitimately belongs to the Supreme Court of the United States, before whom it is now pending, and will, it is understood, be speedily and finally settled. To their decision, in common with all good citizens, I shall cheerfully submit, whatever this may be, though it has ever been my individual opinion that under the Nebraska-Kansas act the appropriate period will be when the number of actual residents in the Territory shall justify the formation of a Constitution with a view to its admission as a State into the Union. But be this as it may, it is the imperative and indispensable duty of the government of the United States to secure to every resident inhabitant the free and independent expression of his opinion by his vote. This sacred right of each individual must be preserved. That being accomplished, nothing can be fairer than to leave the people of a Territory free from all foreign interference, to decide their own destiny for themselves, subject only to the Constitution of the United States.

The whole Territorial question being settled upon the principle of popular sovereignty—a principle as ancient as

free government itself—everything of a practical nature has been decided. No other question remains for adjustment, because all agree that under the Constitution slavery in the States is beyond any human power except that of the respective States themselves wherein it exists. May we not, then, hope that the long agitation on this subject is approaching its end, and that the geographical parties to which it has given birth, so much dreaded by the Father of his Country, will speedily become extinct? Most happy will it be for the country when the public mind shall be diverted from this question to others of more pressing and practical importance. Throughout the whole progress of this agitation, which has scarcely known any intermission for more than twenty years, while it has been productive of no positive good to any human being, it has been the prolific source of great evils to the master, to the slave, and to the whole country. It has alienated and estranged the people of the sister States from each other, and has even seriously endangered the very existence of the Union. Nor has the danger yet entirely ceased. Under our system there is a remedy for all mere political evils in the sound sense and sober judgment of the people. Time is a great corrective. Political subjects which but a few years ago excited and exasperated the public mind have passed away and are now entirely forgotten. But this question of domestic slavery is of far graver importance than any mere political question, because, should the agitation continue, it may eventually endanger the personal safety of a large portion of our countrymen where the institution exists. In that event no form of government, however admirable in itself, and however productive of material benefits, can compensate for the loss of peace and domestic security around the

family altar. Let every Union-loving man, therefore, exert his best influence to suppress this agitation, which, since the recent legislation of Congress, is without any legitimate object.

It is an evil omen of the times that men have undertaken to calculate the mere material value of the Union. Reasoned estimates have been presented of the pecuniary profits and local advantages which would result to the different States and sections from its dissolution, and of the comparative injuries which such an event would inflict on other States and sections. Even descending to this low and narrow view of the mighty question, all such calculations are at fault. The bare reference to a single consideration will be conclusive on this point. We at present enjoy a free trade throughout our extensive and expanding country such as the world has never witnessed. This trade is conducted on railroads and canals, on noble rivers and arms of the sea, which bind together the North and South, the East and West, of our confederacy. Annihilate this trade, arrest its free progress by the geographical lines of jealous and hostile States, and you destroy the prosperity and onward march of the whole and every part, and involve all in a common ruin. But such considerations, important as they are in themselves, sink into insignificance when we reflect upon the terrific evils which would result from disunion to every portion of the confederacy—to the North not more than to the South, to the East not more than to the West. These I shall not attempt to portray, because I feel a humble confidence that the kind Providence which inspired our fathers with wisdom to frame the most perfect form of government and union ever devised by man, will not suffer it to perish until it shall have been peacefully instrumental, by its

example, in the extension of civil and religious liberty throughout the world.

Next in importance to the maintenance of the Constitution and the Union, is the duty of preserving the government free from the taint or even the suspicion of corruption. Public virtue is the vital spirit of republics, and history proves that when this has decayed and the love of money has usurped its place, although the forms of free government may remain for a season, the substance has departed forever.

Our present financial condition is without parallel in history. No nation has ever before been embarrassed from too large a surplus in its Treasury. This almost necessarily gives birth to extravagant legislation. It produces wild schemes of expenditure, and begets a race of speculators and jobbers, whose ingenuity is exerted in contriving and promoting expedients to obtain public money. The purity of official agents, whether rightfully or wrongfully, is suspected, and the character of the government suffers in the estimation of the people. This is in itself a very great evil.

The natural mode of relief from this embarrassment is to appropriate the surplus in the Treasury to great national objects for which a clear warrant can be found in the Constitution. Among these I might mention the extinguishment of the public debt, a reasonable increase of the navy, which is at present inadequate to the protection of our vast tonnage afloat, now greater than any other nation, as well as the defence of our extended seacoast.

It is beyond all question the true principle that no more revenue ought to be collected from the people than the amount necessary to defray the expense of a wise, econom-

ical, and efficient administration of the government. To reach this point it was necessary to resort to a modification of the tariff, and this has, I trust, been accomplished in such a manner as to do as little injury as may have been practicable to our domestic manufactures, especially those necessary for the defence of the country. Any discrimination against a particular branch for the purpose of benefiting favored corporations, individuals, or interests, would have been unjust to the rest of the community and inconsistent with that spirit of fairness and equality which ought to govern in the adjustment of a revenue tariff.

But the squandering of the public money sinks into comparative insignificance as a temptation to corruption when compared with the squandering of the public lands.

No nation in the tide of time has ever been blessed with so rich and noble an inheritance as we enjoy in the public lands. In administering this important trust, while it may be wise to grant portions of them for the improvement of the remainder, yet we should never forget that it is our cardinal policy to reserve these lands, as much as may be, for actual settlers, and this at moderate prices. We shall thus not only best promote the prosperity of the new States and Territories, by furnishing them a hardy and independent race of honest and industrious citizens, but shall secure homes for our children and our children's children, as well as for those exiles from foreign shores who may seek in this country to improve their condition and to enjoy the blessings of civil and religious liberty. Such immigrants have done much to promote the growth and prosperity of the country. They have proved faithful both in peace and in war. After becoming citizens they are entitled, under the Constitution and laws, to be placed on

a perfect equality with native-born citizens, and in this character they should ever be kindly recognized.

The Federal Constitution is a grant from the States to Congress of certain specific powers, and the question whether this grant should be liberally or strictly construed has more or less divided political parties from the beginning. Without entering into the argument, I desire to state at the commencement of my administration that long experience and observation have convinced me that a strict construction of the powers of the government is the only true, as well as the only safe, theory of the Constitution. Whenever in our past history doubtful powers have been exercised by Congress, these have never failed to produce injurious and unhappy consequences. Many such instances might be adduced if this were the proper occasion. Neither is it necessary for the public service to strain the language of the Constitution, because all the great and useful powers required for a successful administration of the government, both in peace and in war, have been granted, either in express terms or by the plainest implication.

While deeply convinced of these truths, I yet consider it clear that under the war-making power Congress may appropriate money toward the construction of a military road when this is absolutely necessary for the defence of any State or Territory of the Union against foreign invasion. Under the Constitution Congress has power "to declare war," "to raise and support armies," "to provide and maintain a navy," and to call forth the militia to "repel invasions." Thus endowed, in an ample manner, with the war-making power, the corresponding duty is required that "the United States shall protect each of them [the States] against invasion." Now, how is it possible to afford this

protection to California and our Pacific possessions, except by means of a military road through the territories of the United States, over which men and munitions of war may be speedily transported from the Atlantic States to meet and to repel the invader? In the event of a war with a naval power much stronger than our own, we should then have no other available access to the Pacific coast, because such a power would instantly close the route across the isthmus of Central America. It is impossible to conceive that while the Constitution has expressly required Congress to defend all the States, it should yet deny to them, by any fair construction, the only possible means by which one of these States can be defended. Besides, the government, ever since its origin, has been in the constant practice of constructing military roads. It might also be wise to consider whether the love for the Union which now animates our fellow-citizens on the Pacific coast may not be impaired by our neglect or refusal to provide for them, in their remote and isolated condition, the only means by which the power of the States on this side of the Rocky Mountains can reach them in sufficient time to "protect" them "against invasion." I forbear for the present from expressing an opinion as to the wisest and most economical mode in which the government can lend its aid in accomplishing this great and necessary work. I believe that many of the difficulties in the way, which now appear formidable, will in a great degree vanish as soon as the nearest and best route shall have been satisfactorily ascertained.

It may be proper that on this occasion I should make some brief remarks in regard to our rights and duties as a member of the great family of nations. In our intercourse with them there are some plain principles, approved by our

own experience, from which we should never depart. We ought to cultivate peace, commerce, and friendship with all nations, and this not merely as the best means of promoting our own material interests, but in a spirit of Christian benevolence toward our fellow-men, wherever their lot may be cast. Our diplomacy should be direct and frank, neither seeking to obtain more nor accepting less than is due. We ought to cherish a sacred regard for the independence of all nations, and never attempt to interfere in the domestic concerns of any unless this shall be imperatively required by the great law of self-preservation. To avoid entangling alliances has been a maxim of our policy ever since the days of Washington, and its wisdom no one will attempt to dispute. In short, we ought to do justice in a kindly spirit to all nations, and require justice from them in return.

It is our glory that while other nations have extended their dominions by the sword, we have never acquired any territory except by fair purchase or, in the case of Texas, by the voluntary determination of a brave, kindred, and independent people to blend their destinies with our own. Even our acquisitions from Mexico form no exception. Unwilling to take advantage of the fortune of war against a sister republic, we purchased these possessions under the treaty of peace for a sum which was considered at the time a fair equivalent. Our past history forbids that we shall in the future acquire territory unless this be sanctioned by the laws of justice and honor. Acting on this principle, no nation will have a right to interfere or to complain if, in the progress of events, we shall still further extend our possessions. Hitherto in all our acquisitions the people, under the protection of the American flag, have enjoyed civil and religious liberty as well as equal and just laws,

and have been contented, prosperous, and happy. Their trade with the rest of the world has rapidly increased, and thus every commercial nation has shared largely in their successful progress.

I shall now proceed to take the oath prescribed by the Constitution, while humbly invoking the blessing of Divine Providence on this great people.

March 4, 1857.

HAYNE

ROBERT YOUNG HAYNE, an American orator and politician, was born in St. Paul's Parish, Colleton District, South Carolina, November 10, 1791. After pursuing the study of law he was admitted to the bar in 1812. He served in a South Carolina regiment during the second war with England; at its close he entered the State legislature, where he was speaker of the House, 1818-22. He became attorney-general of the State in the last-named year and was elected to the United States Senate, where he actively opposed the protective system, declaring in a famous speech, delivered in 1824, that a tariff was unconstitutional. In January, 1830, he took part in a very celebrated debate with Daniel Webster upon the principles of the constitution, and vehemently urged the constitutional right of secession. In 1832 he was chairman of the South Carolina convention which adopted an ordinance of nullification, and was elected governor that same year. In answer to President Jackson's proclamation respecting nullification Hayne issued a fiery proclamation of defiance and prepared to resist the federal authority. Through the offices of Henry Clay a compromise was effected, however, and the nullification ordinance was repealed in a second convention. Hayne retired from the governorship in 1834, and from 1835 to 1837 was mayor of Charleston. He died at Asheville, North Carolina, September 24, 1839. Hayne's "Life and Speeches" appeared in 1845.

ON FOOT'S RESOLUTION[1]

DELIVERED IN THE UNITED STATES SENATE, JANUARY 21, 1830.[2]

MR. President,—When I took occasion, two days ago, to throw out some ideas with respect to the policy of the government in relation to the public lands, nothing certainly could have been further from my thoughts than that I should have been compelled again to throw myself

[1]The following is the resolution of Mr. Foot: "Resolved, that the Committee on Public Lands be instructed to inquire and report the quantity of the public lands remaining unsold within each State and Territory, and whether it be expedient to limit, for a certain period, the sales of the public lands to such lands only as have heretofore been offered for sale, and are now subject to entry at the minimum price. And, also, whether the office of surveyor-general, and some of the land offices, may not be abolished without detriment to the public interest; or whether it be expedient to adopt measures to hasten the sales and extend more rapidly the surveys of the public lands."

[2]See Mr. Webster's answer to this speech at page 4427 ante.

upon the indulgence of the Senate. Little did I expect to be called upon to meet such an argument as was yesterday urged by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Webster].

Sir, I questioned no man's opinions; I impeached no man's motives; I charged no party or State or section of country with hostility to any other, but ventured, as I thought in a becoming spirit, to put forth my own sentiments in relation to a great national question of public policy.

Such was my course. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Benton], it is true, had charged upon the Eastern States an early and continued hostility toward the West, and referred to a number of historical facts and documents in support of that charge. Now, sir, how have these different arguments been met? The honorable gentleman from Massachusetts, after deliberating a whole night upon his course, comes into this chamber to vindicate New England, and instead of making up his issue with the gentleman from Missouri on the charges which he had preferred, chooses to consider me as the author of those charges, and, losing sight entirely of that gentleman, selects me as his adversary and pours out all the vials of his mighty wrath upon my devoted head. Nor is he willing to stop there.

He goes on to assail the institutions and policy of the South, and calls in question the principles and conduct of the State which I have the honor to represent. When I find a gentleman of mature age and experience, of acknowledged talents and profound sagacity, pursuing a course like this, declining the contest offered from the West, and making war upon the unoffending South, I must believe, I am bound to believe, he has some object in view which he has not ventured to disclose.

Mr. President, why is this? Has the gentleman discovered

in former controversies with the gentleman from Missouri that he is overmatched by that senator? And does he hope for an easy victory over a more feeble adversary? Has the gentleman's distempered fancy been disturbed by gloomy forebodings of "new alliances to be formed" at which he hinted? Has the ghost of the murdered Coalition come back, like the ghost of Banquo, to "sear the eyeballs of the gentleman," and will it not "down at his bidding?" Are dark visions of broken hopes, and honors lost forever, still floating before his heated imagination? Sir, if it be his object to thrust me between the gentleman from Mssouri and himself, in order to rescue the East from the contest it has provoked with the West, he shall not be gratified. Sir, I will not be dragged into the defence of my friend from Missouri. The South shall not be forced into a conflict not its own. The gentleman from Missouri is able to fight his own battles. The gallant West needs no aid from the South to repel any attack which may be made on them from any quarter. Let the gentleman from Massachusetts controvert the facts and arguments of the gentleman from Missouri if he can, and if he win the victory let him wear the honors; I shall not deprive him of his laurels.

The gentleman from Massachusetts, in reply to my remarks on the injurious operations of our land system on the prosperity of the West, pronounced an extravagant eulogium on the paternal care which the government had extended toward the West, to which he attributed all that was great and excellent in the present condition of the new States.

The language of the gentleman on this topic fell upon my ears like the almost forgotten tones of the Tory leaders of the British Parliament at the commencement of the American revolution. They, too, discovered that the colonies had

grown great under the fostering care of the mother country; and I must confess, while listening to the gentleman, I thought the appropriate reply to his argument was to be found in the remark of a celebrated orator made on that occasion: "They have grown great in spite of your protection."

The gentleman, in commenting on the policy of the government in relation to the new States, has introduced to our notice a certain Nathan Dane, of Massachusetts, to whom he attributes the celebrated Ordinance of 1787, by which, he tells us, "slavery was forever excluded from the new States north of the Ohio." After eulogizing the wisdom of this provision in terms of the most extravagant praise he breaks forth in admiration of the greatness of Nathan Dane—and great indeed he must be if it be true, as stated by the senator from Massachusetts, that "he was greater than Solon and Lycurgus, Minos, Numa Pompilius, and all the legislators and philosophers of the world," ancient and modern.

Sir, to such high authority it is certainly my duty, in a becoming spirit of humility, to submit. And yet the gentleman will pardon me when I say that it is a little unfortunate for the fame of this great legislator that the gentleman from Missouri should have proved that he was not the author of the Ordinance of 1787, on which the senator from Massachusetts has reared so glorious a monument to his name.

Sir, I doubt not the senator will feel some compassion for our ignorance when I tell him that, so little are we acquainted with the modern great men of New England, that until he informed us yesterday that we possessed a Solon and a Lycurgus in the person of Nathan Dane he was only known to the South as a member of a celebrated assembly called and known by the name of "the Hartford Convention." In the proceedings of that assembly, which I hold in my hand (at page 19),

will be found, in a few lines, the history of Nathan Dane; and a little farther on there is conclusive evidence of that ardent devotion to the interests of the new States which it seems has given him a just claim to the title of "Father of the West." By the second resolution of the Hartford Convention it is declared "that it is expedient to attempt to make provision for restraining Congress in the exercise of an unlimited power to make new States and admitting them to the Union." So much for Nathan Dane, of Beverly, Massachusetts.

In commenting upon my views in relation to the public lands the gentleman insists that, it being one of the conditions of the grants that these lands should be applied to "the common benefit of all the States, they must always remain a fund for revenue;" and adds, "they must be treated as so much treasure."

Sir, the gentleman could hardly find language strong enough to convey his disapprobation of the policy which I had ventured to recommend to the favorable consideration of the country. And what, sir, was that policy, and what is the difference between that gentleman and myself on this subject?

I threw out the idea that the public lands ought not to be reserved forever as "a great fund of revenue;" that they ought not to be "treated as a great treasure;" but, that the course of our policy should rather be directed toward the creation of new States and building up great and flourishing communities.

Now, sir, will it be believed by those who now hear me, and who listened to the gentleman's denunciation of my doctrines yesterday, that a book then lay open before him—nay, that he held it in his hand and read from it certain passages of his own speech delivered to the House of Representatives

in 1825, in which speech he himself contended for the very doctrines I had advocated and almost in the same terms. Here is the speech of the Hon. Daniel Webster, contained in the first volume of Gales & Seaton's "Register of Debates" (p. 251), delivered in the House of Representatives on the 18th of January, 1825, in a debate on the Cumberland Road —the very debate from which the senator read yesterday.

I shall read from the celebrated speech two passages, from which it will appear that both as to the past and the future policy of the government in relation to the public lands the gentleman from Massachusetts maintained in 1825 substantially the same opinions which I have advanced, but which he now so strongly reprobates. I said, sir, that the system of credit sales by which the West had been kept constantly in debt to the United States, and by which their wealth was drained off to be expended elsewhere, had operated injuriously on their prosperity. On this point the gentleman from Massachusetts, in January, 1825, expressed himself thus:

"There could be no doubt if gentlemen looked at the money received into the treasury from the sale of the public lands to the West, and then looked to the whole amount expended by the government (even including the whole amount of what was laid out for the army) the latter must be allowed to be very inconsiderable, and there must be a constant drain of money from the West to pay for the public lands. It might indeed be said that this was no more than the refluence of capital which had previously gone over the mountains. Be it so. Still its practical effect was to produce inconvenience, if not distress, by absorbing the money of the people."

I contended that the public lands ought not to be treated merely as "a fund for revenue," that they ought not to be hoarded "as a great treasure."

On this point the senator expressed himself thus:

"Government, he believed, had received eighteen or twenty millions of dollars from the public lands, and it was with the greatest satisfaction he adverted to the change which had been introduced in the mode of paying for them; yet he could never think the national domain was to be regarded as any great source of revenue. The great object of the government in respect of these lands was not so much the money derived from their sale as it was the getting them settled. What he meant to say was, he did not think they ought to hug that domain as a great treasure which was to enrich the exchequer."

Now, Mr. President, it will be seen that the very doctrines which the gentleman so indignantly abandons were urged by him in 1825; and if I had actually borrowed my sentiments from those which he then avowed I could not have followed more closely in his footsteps. Sir, it is only since the gentleman quoted this book yesterday that my attention has been turned to the sentiments he expressed in 1825, and, if I had remembered them, I might possibly have been deterred from uttering sentiments here which it might well be supposed I had borrowed from that gentleman.

In 1825 the gentleman told the world that the public lands "ought not to be treated as a treasure." He now tells us that "they must be treated as so much treasure."

What the deliberate opinion of the gentleman on this subject may be belongs not to me to determine; but I do not think he can, with the shadow of justice or propriety, impugn my sentiments while his own recorded opinions are identical with my own. When the gentleman refers to the conditions of the grants under which the United States have acquired these lands, and insists that, as they are declared to be "for the common benefit of all the States," they can only be treated as so much treasure, I think he has applied a rule of construction too narrow for the case. If in the deeds of

cession it has been declared that the grants were intended for "the common benefit of all the States," it is clear from other provisions that they were not intended merely as so much property; for it is expressly declared that the object of the grants is the erection of new States; and the United States, in accepting this trust, bind themselves to faciliate the foundation of these States to be admitted into the Union with all the rights and privileges of the original States.

This, sir, was the great end to which all parties looked, and it is by the fulfillment of this high trust that "the common benefit of all the States" is to be best promoted. Sir, let me tell the gentleman that in the part of the country in which I live we do not measure political benefits by the money standard. We consider as more valuable than gold—liberty, principle, and justice. But, sir, if we are bound to act on the narrow principles contended for by the gentleman, I am wholly at a loss to conceive how he can reconcile his principles with his own practice. The lands are, it seems, to be treated "as so much treasure," and must be applied to the "common benefit of all the States."

Now, if this be so, whence does he derive the right to appropriate them for partial and local objects? How can the gentleman consent to vote away immense bodies of these lands for canals in Indiana and Illinois, to the Louisville and Portland canal, to Kenyon College in Ohio, to schools for the deaf and dumb, and other objects of a similar description?

If grants of this character can fairly be considered as made "for the common benefit of all the States," it can only be because all the States are interested in the welfare of each—a principle which, carried to the full extent, destroys all distinction between local and national objects, and is certainly

broad enough to embrace the principles for which I have ventured to contend.

Sir, the true difference between us I take to be this: the gentleman wishes to treat the public lands as a great treasure, just as so much money in the treasury, to be applied to all objects, constitutional and unconstitutional, to which the public money is constantly applied. I consider it as a sacred trust, which we ought to fulfil, on the principles for which I have contended.

The senator from Massachusetts has thought proper to present in strong contrast the friendly feelings of the East towards the West, with sentiments of an opposite character displayed by the South in relation to appropriations for internal improvements. Now, sir, let it be recollected that the South have made no professions; I have certainly made none in their behalf of regard for the West. It has been reserved for the gentleman from Massachusetts, while he vaunts over his own personal devotion to Western interests, to claim for the entire section of country to which he belongs an ardent friendship for the West as manifested by their support of the system of internal improvement, while he casts in our teeth the reproach that the South has manifested hostility to Western interests in opposing appropriations for such objects. That gentleman at the same time acknowledged that the South entertains constitutional scruples on this subject.

Are we then, sir, to understand that the gentleman considers it a just subject of reproach that we respect our oaths by which we are bound "to preserve, protect, and defend the constitution of the United States?" Would the gentleman have us manifest our love to the West by trampling under foot our constitutional scruples? Does he not per-

ceive, if the South is to be reproached with unkindness to the West in voting against appropriations which the gentleman admits they could not vote for without doing violence to their constitutional opinions, that he exposes himself to the question whether, if he was in our situation, he could not vote for these appropriations regardless of his scruples?

No, sir, I will not do the gentleman so great injustice. He has fallen into this error from not having duly weighed the force and effect of the reproach which he was endeavoring to cast upon the South. In relation to the other point, the friendship manifested by New England towards the West in their support of the system of internal improvement, the gentleman will pardon me for saying that I think he is equally unfortunate in having introduced that topic.

As that gentleman has forced it upon us, however, I cannot suffer it to pass unnoticed. When the gentleman tells us that the appropriations for internal improvement in the West would in almost every instance have failed but for New England votes, he has forgotten to tell us the when, the how, and the wherefore this new-born zeal for the West sprang up in the bosom of New England.

If we look back only a few years we will find in both Houses of Congress a uniform and steady opposition on the part of the members from the eastern States generally to all appropriations of this character. At the time I became a member of this House, and for some time afterward, a decided majority of the New England senators were opposed to the very measures which the senator from Massachusetts tells us they now cordially support. Sir, the journals are before me, and an examination of them will satisfy every gentleman of that fact.

It must be well known to every one whose experience dates

back as far as 1825 that up to a certain period New England was generally opposed to appropriations for internal improvements in the West. The gentleman from Massachusetts may be himself an exception, but if he went for the system before 1825 it is certain that his colleagues did not go with him. In the session of 1824 and 1825, however (a memorable era in the history of this country), a wonderful change took place in New England in relation to Western interests.

Sir, an extraordinary union of sympathies and of interests was then effected which brought the East and the West into close alliance. The book from which I have before read contains the first public annunciation of that happy reconciliation of conflicting interests, personal and political, which brought the East and West together and locked in a fraternal embrace the two great orators of the East and the West.

Sir, it was on the 18th of January, 1825, while the result of the presidential election in the House of Representatives was still doubtful, while the whole country was looking with intense anxiety to that legislative hall where the mighty drama was so soon to be acted, that we saw the leaders of two great parties in the House and in the nation "taking sweet counsel together," and in a celebrated debate on the Cumberland Road fighting side by side for Western interests.

It was on that memorable occasion that the senator from Massachusetts held out the white flag to the West and uttered those liberal sentiments which he yesterday so indignantly repudiated. Then it was that that happy union between the members of the celebrated coalition was consummated, whose immediate issue was a president from one quarter of the Union with the succession (as it was supposed) secured to another.

The "American System," before a rude, disjointed, and

misshapen mass, now assumed form and consistency: then it was that it became the "settled policy of the government" that this system should be so administered as to create a reciprocity of interest and a reciprocal distribution of government favors East and West (the tariff and internal improvments), while the South—yes, sir, the impracticable South—was to be "out of your protection."

The gentleman may boast as much as he pleases of the friendship of New England for the West as displayed in their support of internal improvement; but when he next introduces that topic I trust that he will tell us when that friendship commenced, how it was brought about, and why it was established.

Before I leave this topic I must be permitted to say that the true character of the policy now pursued by the gentleman from Massachusetts and his friends in relation to appropriations of land and money for the benefit of the West is in my estimation very similar to that pursued by Jacob of old toward his brother Esau—it robs them of their birthright for a mess of pottage.

The gentleman from Massachusetts, in alluding to a remark of mine that before any disposition could be made of the public lands the national debt (for which they stand pledged) must be first paid, took occasion to intimate "that the extraordinary fervor which seems to exist in a certain quarter (meaning the South, sir) for the payment of the debt arises from a disposition to weaken the ties which bind the people to the Union."

While the gentleman deals us this blow he professes an ardent desire to see the debt speedily extinguished. He must excuse me, however, for feeling some distrust on that subject until I find this disposition manifested by something stronger

than professions. I shall look for acts, decided and unequivocal acts, for the performance of which an opportunity will very soon (if I am not greatly mistaken) be afforded.

Sir, if I were at liberty to judge of the course which that gentleman would pursue from the principles which he has laid down in relation to this matter, I should be bound to conclude that he will be found acting with those with whom it is a darling object to prevent the payment of the public debt. He tells us he is desirous of paying the debt, "because we are under an obligation to discharge it."

Now, sir, suppose it should happen that the public creditors with whom we have contracted the obligation should release us from it so far as to declare their willingness to wait for payment for fifty years to come, provided only that the interest shall be punctually discharged. The gentleman from Massachusetts will then be released from the obligation which now makes him desirous of paying the debt; and let me tell the gentleman the holders of the stock will not only release us from this obligation, but they will implore, nay, they will even pay us not to pay them.

But, adds the gentleman, so far as the debt may have an effect in binding the debtors to the country, and thereby serving as a link to hold the States together, he would be glad that it should exist forever. Surely then, sir, on the gentleman's own principles, he must be opposed to the payment of the debt.

Sir, let me tell that gentleman that the South repudiates the idea that a pecuniary dependence on the federal government is one of the legitimate means of holding the States together. A moneyed interest in the government is essentially a base interest; and just so far as it operates to bind the feelings of those who are subjected to it to the government,—just so far

as it operates in creating sympathies and interests that would not otherwise exist,—is it opposed to all the principles of free government and at war with virtue and patriotism.

Sir, the link which binds the public creditors, as such, to their country, binds them equally to all governments, whether arbitrary or free. In a free government this principle of abject dependence, if extended through all the ramifications of society, must be fatal to liberty.

Already have we made alarming strides in that direction. The entire class of manufacturers, the holders of stock, with their hundreds of millions of capital, are held to the government by the strong link of pecuniary interests; millions of people—entire sections of country, interested, or believing themselves to be so, in the public lands and the public treasure, are bound to the government by the expectation of pecuniary favors.

If this system is carried much farther no man can fail to see that every generous motive of attachment to the country will be destroyed, and in its place will spring up those low, groveling, base, and selfish feelings which bind men to the footstool of a despot by bonds as strong and enduring as those which attach them to free institutions. Sir, I would lay the foundation of this government in the affections of the people—I would teach them to cling to it by dispensing equal justice, and, above all, by securing the "blessings of liberty" to "themselves and to their posterity."

The honorable gentleman from Massachusetts has gone out of his way to pass a high eulogium on the State of Ohio. In the most impassioned tones of eloquence he described her majestic march to greatness. He told us that, having already left all the other States far behind, she was now passing by Virginia and Pennsylvania and about to take her station by

the side of New York. To all this, sir, I was disposed most cordially to respond. When, however, the gentleman proceeded to contrast the State of Ohio with Kentucky, to the disadvantage of the latter, I listened to him with regret; and when he proceeded further to attribute the great, and, as he supposed, acknowledged superiority of the former in population, wealth, and general prosperity, to the policy of Nathan Dane, of Massachusetts, which had secured to the people of Ohio (by the Ordinance of 1787) a population of freemen, I will confess that my feelings suffered a revulsion which I am now unable to describe in any language sufficiently respectful toward the gentleman from Massachusetts. In contrasting the State of Ohio with Kentucky for the purpose of pointing out the superiority of the former and of attributing that superiority to the existence of slavery in the one State and its absence in the other, I thought I could discern the very spirit of the Missouri question intruded into this debate for objects best known to the gentleman himself.

Did that gentleman, sir, when he formed the determination to cross the Southern border in order to invade the State of South Carolina, deem it prudent or necessary to enlist under his banners the prejudices of the world, which, like Swiss troops, may be engaged in any cause and are prepared to serve under any leader?

Did he desire to avail himself of those remorseless allies, the passions of mankind, of which it may be more truly said than of the savage tribes of the wilderness, "that their known rule of warfare is an indiscriminate slaughter of all ages, sexes, and conditions?"

Or was it supposed, sir, that in a premeditated and unprovoked attack upon the South it was advisable to begin by a gentle admonition of our supposed weakness in order to pre-

vent us from making that firm and manly resistance due to our own character and our dearest interest? Was the significant hint of the weakness of slaveholding States when contrasted with the superior strength of free States, like the glare of the weapon half drawn from its scabbard, intended to enforce the lessons of prudence and patriotism which the gentleman had resolved, out of his abundant generosity, gratuitously to bestow upon us?

Mr. President, the impression which has gone abroad of the weakness of the South as connected with the slave question exposes us to such constant attacks, has done us so much injury, and is calculated to produce such infinite mischiefs, that I embrace the occasion presented by the remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts to declare that we are ready to meet the question promptly and fearlessly. It is one from which we are not disposed to shrink in whatever form or under whatever circumstances it may be pressed upon us.

We are ready to make up the issue with the gentleman as to the influence of slavery on individual and national character, on the prosperity and greatness either of the United States or of particular States. Sir, when arraigned before the bar of public opinion on this charge of slavery we can stand up with conscious rectitude, plead not guilty, and put ourselves upon God and our country. Sir, we will not consent to look at slavery in the abstract. We will not stop to inquire whether the black man, as some philosophers have contended, is of an inferior race, nor whether his color and condition are effects of a curse inflicted for the offences of his ancestors? We deal in no abstractions. We will not look back to inquire whether our fathers were guiltless in introducing slaves into this country? If an inquiry should ever be instituted in these matters, however, it will be found that the profits of the slave-trade

were not confined to the South. Southern ships and Southern sailors were not the instruments of bringing slaves to the shores of America, nor did our merchants reap the profits of that "accursed traffic."

But, sir, we will pass over all this. If slavery, as it now exists in this country, be an evil, we of the present day found it ready made to our hands. Finding our lot cast among a people whom God had manifestly committed to our care we did not sit down to speculate on abstract questions of theoretical liberty. We met it as a practical question of obligation and duty. We resolved to make the best of the situation in which Providence had placed us, and to fulfill the high trusts which had devolved upon us as the owners of slaves in the only way in which such a trust could be fulfilled without spreading misery and ruin throughout the land.

We found that we had to deal with a people whose physical, moral, and intellectual habits and character totally disqualified them from the enjoyment of the blessings of freedom. We could not send them back to the shores from whence their fathers had been taken; their numbers forbade the thought, even if we did not know that their condition here is infinitely preferable to what it possibly could be among the barren sands and savage tribes of Africa; and it was wholly irreconcilable with all our notions of humanity to tear asunder the tender ties which they had formed among us to gratify the feelings of a false philanthropy.

What a commentary on the wisdom, justice, and humanity of the Southern slave-owner is presented by the example of certain benevolent associations and charitable individuals elsewhere! Shedding weak tears over sufferings which had existence only in their own sickly imaginations, these "friends of humanity" set themselves systematically to work to seduce the

slaves of the South from their masters. By means of missionaries and political tracts the scheme was in a great measure successful. Thousands of these deluded victims of fanaticism were seduced into the enjoyment of freedom in our northern cities.

And what has been the consequence? Go to these cities now and ask the question. Visit the dark and narrow lanes and obscure recesses which have been assigned by common consent as the abodes of those outcasts of the world—the free people of color. Sir, there does not exist on the face of the whole earth a population so poor, so wretched, so vile, so loathsome, so utterly destitute of all the comforts, conveniences, and decencies of life as the unfortunate blacks of Philadelphia, New York, and Boston. Liberty has been to them the greatest of calamities, the heaviest of curses.

Sir, I have had some opportunities of making comparison between the condition of the free negroes of the north and the slaves of the south, and the comparison has left not only an indelible impression of the superior advantages of the latter, but has gone far to reconcile me to slavery itself. Never have I felt so forcibly that touching description, "The foxes have holes, and the birds of the air have nests, but the Son of Man hath not where to lay his head," as when I have seen this unhappy race, naked and houseless, almost starving in the streets, and abandoned by all the world. Sir, I have seen, in the neighborhood of one of the most moral, religious, and refined cities of the north, a family of free blacks driven to the caves of the rocks, and there obtaining a precarious subsistence from charity and plunder.

When the gentleman from Massachusetts adopts and reiterates the old charge of weakness as resulting from slavery I must be permitted to call for the proof of those blighting

effects which he ascribes to its influence. I suspect that when the subject is closely examined it will be found that there is not much force even on the plausible objection of the want of physical power in slave-holding States. The power of a country is compounded of its population and its wealth, and in modern times, where, from the very form and structure of society, by far the greater portion of the people must, even during the continuance of the most desolating wars, be employed in the cultivation of the soil and other peaceful pursuits, it may be well doubted whether slave-holding States, by reason of a superior value of their productions are not able to maintain a number of troops in the field fully equal to what could be supported by States with a larger white population but not possessed of equal resources. . . .

Mr. President, I wish it to be distinctly understood that all the remarks I have made on this subject are intended to be exclusively applied to a party which I have described as the "Peace Party of New England," embracing the political associates of the senator from Massachusetts—a party which controlled the operations of that State during the embargo and the war, and who are justly chargeable with all the measures I have reprobated. Sir, nothing has been further from my thoughts than to impeach the character or conduct of the people of New England. For their steady habits and hardy virtues I trust I entertain a becoming respect. I fully subscribe to the truth of the description given before the Revolution by one whose praise is the highest eulogy, "that the perseverance of Holland, the activity of France, and the dexterous and firm sagacity of English enterprise have been more than equalled by this recent people." Hardy, enterprising, sagacious, industrious, and moral, the people of New England of the present day are worthy of their ancestors. Still less, Mr.

President, has it been my intention to say anything that could be construed into a want of respect for that party who, trampling on all narrow, sectional feelings, have been true to their principles in the worst times,—I mean the Democracy of New England.

Sir, I will declare that, highly as I appreciate the Democracy of the South, I consider even higher praise to be due to the Democracy of New England, who have maintained their principles "through good and through evil report," who at every period of our national history have stood up manfully for "their country, their whole country, and nothing but their country." In the great political revolution of '98 they were found united with the Democracy of the South, marching under the banner of the constitution, led on by the patriarch of liberty in search of the land of political promise which they lived not only to behold but to possess and to enjoy.

Again, sir, in the darkest and most gloomy period of the war, when our country stood single-handed against "the conqueror of the conquerors of the world," when all about and around them was dark, and dreary, disastrous and discouraging, they stood a Spartan band in that narrow pass where the honor of their country was to be defended or to find its grave.

And in the last great struggle, involving, as we believe, the very existence of the principle of popular sovereignty, where were the Democracy of New England? Where they always have been found, sir, struggling side by side with their brethren of the South and the West for popular rights, and assisting in that glorious triumph by which the man of the people was elevated to the highest office in their gift.

Who, then, Mr. President, are the true friends of the Union? Those who would confine the federal government strictly within the limits prescribed by the constitution; who

would preserve to the States and the people all powers not expressly delegated; who would make this a federal and not a national union, and who, administering the government in a spirit of equal justice, would make it a blessing and not a curse. And who are its enemies? Those who are in favor of consolidation, who are constantly stealing power from the States and adding strength to the federal government. Who, assuming an unwarrantable jurisdiction over the States and the people, undertake to regulate the whole industry and capital of the country. But, sir, of all descriptions of men, I consider those as the worst enemies of the Union who sacrifice the equal rights which belong to every member of the confederacy to combinations of interested majorities for personal or political objects.

But the gentleman apprehends no evil from the dependence of the States on the federal government; he can see no danger of corruption from the influence of money or of patronage. Sir, I know that it is supposed to be a wise saying "that patronage is a source of weakness," and in support of that maxim it has been said that "every ten appointments made a hundred enemies."

But I am rather inclined to think, with the eloquent and sagacious orator now reposing on his laurels on the banks of the Roanoke, that "the power of conferring favors creates a crowd of dependents;" he gave a forcible illustration of the truth of the remark, when he told us of the effect of holding up the savory morsel to the eager eyes of the hungry hounds gathered around his door. It mattered not whether the gift was bestowed on Towser or Sweetlips, "Tray, Blanche, or Sweetheart;" while held in suspense they were all governed by a nod, and when the morsel was bestowed the expectation of the favors of to-morrow kept up the subjection of to-day.

The senator from Massachusetts, in denouncing what he is pleased to call the Carolina doctrine, has attempted to throw ridicule upon the idea that a State has any constitutional remedy, by the exercise of its sovereign authority, against "a gross, palpable, and deliberate violation of the constitution." He calls it "an idle" or "ridiculous notion," or something to that effect, and added that it would make the Union "a mere rope of sand."

Now, sir, as the gentleman has not condescended to enter into any examination of the question, and has been satisfied with throwing the weight of his authority into the scale, I do not deem it necessary to do more than to throw into the opposite scale the authority on which South Carolina relies; and there for the present I am perfectly willing to leave the controversy. The South Carolina doctrine—that is to say, the doctrine contained in an exposition reported by a committee of the legislature in December, 1828, and published by their authority—is the good old Republican doctrine of '98—the doctrine of the celebrated "Virginia Resolutions" of that year, and of "Madison's Report" of '99.

It will be recollected that the legislature of Virginia, in December, 1898, took into consideration the Alien and Sedition Laws, then considered by all republicans as a gross violation of the constitution of the United States, and on that day passed, among others, the following resolution:

"The General Assembly doth explicitly and peremptorily declare that it views the powers of the federal government as resulting from the compact to which the States are parties, as limited by the plain sense and intention of the instrument constituting that compact, as no further valid than they are authorized by the grants enumerated in that compact; and that in case of a deliberate, palpable, and dangerous exercise of other powers not granted by the said compact, the States

who are parties thereto have the right and are in duty bound to interpose for arresting the progress of the evil, and for maintaining within their respective limits the authorities, rights, and liberties appertaining to them."

In addition to the above resolution the General Assembly of Virginia "appealed to the other States in the confidence that they would concur with that commonwealth, that the act aforesaid (the Alien and Sedition Laws) are unconstitutional, and that the necessary and proper measures would be taken by each for co-operating with Virginia in maintaining unimpaired the authorities, rights, and liberties reserved to the States respectively or to the people."

The legislatures of several of the New England States, having, contrary to the expectation of the legislature of Virginia, expressed their dissent from these doctrines; the subject came up again for consideration during the session of 1799-1800 when it was referred to a select committee by whom was made that celebrated report which is familiarly known as "Madison's Report," and which deserves to last as long as the constitution itself.

In that report, which was subsequently adopted by the legislature, the whole subject was deliberately re-examined, and the objection urged against the Virginia doctrines carefully considered. The result was that the legislature of Virginia reaffirmed all the principles laid down in the resolutions of 1798, and issued to the world that admirable report which has stamped the character of Mr. Madison as the preserver of that constitution which he had contributed so largely to create and establish.

I will here quote from Mr. Madison's report one or two passages which bear more immediately on the point in controversy:

"The resolution, having taken this view of the federal compact, proceeds to infer 'that in case of a deliberate, palpable, and dangerous exercise of other powers not granted by the said compact, the States who are parties thereto have the right, and are in duty bound, to interpose for arresting the progress of the evil, and for maintaining within their respective limits the authorities, right, and liberties appertaining to them.'

"It appears to your committee to be a plain principle, founded in common sense, illustrated by common practice, and essential to the nature of compacts, that, where resort can be had to no tribunal superior to the authority of the parties, the parties themselves must be the rightful judges in the last resort whether the bargain made has been pursued or violated. The constitution of the United States was formed by the sanction of the States, given by each in its sovereign capacity. It adds to the stability and dignity as well as to the authority of the constitution that it rests upon this legitimate and solid foundation. The States, then, being the parties to the constitutional compact, and in their sovereign capacity, it follows of necessity, that there can be no tribunal above their authority to decide in the last resort whether the compact made by them be violated; and, consequently, that, as the parties to it they must themselves decide in the last resort such questions as may be of sufficient magnitude to require their interposition.

"The resolution has guarded against any misapprehension of its object by expressly requiring for such an interposition 'the case of a deliberate, palpable, and dangerous breach of the constitution by the exercise of powers not granted by it.' It must be a case, not of a light and transient nature, but of a nature dangerous to the great purposes for which the constitution was established.

"But the resolution has done more than guard against misconstruction by expressly referring to cases of a deliberate, palpable, and dangerous nature. It specifies the object of the interposition which it contemplates to be solely that of arresting the progress of the evil of usurpation, and of maintaining the authorities, rights, and liberties appertaining to the States as parties to the constitution.

"From this view of the resolution it would seem inconceivable that it can incur any just disapprobation from those who, laying aside all momentary impressions and recollecting the genuine source and object of the federal constitution, shall candidly and accurately interpret the meaning of the general assembly. If the deliberate exercise of dangerous powers, palpably withheld by the constitution, could not justify the parties to it in interposing, even so far as to arrest the progress of the evil and thereby to preserve the constitution itself as well as to provide for the safety of the parties to it, there would be an end to all relief from usurped power and a direct subversion of the rights specified or recognized under all the State constitutions, as well as a plain denial of the fundamental principles on which our independence itself was declared."

But, sir, our authorities do not stop here. The State of Kentucky responded to Virginia, and on the 10th of November, 1798, adopted those celebrated resolutions well known to have been penned by the author of the Declaration of American Independence. In those resolutions the legislature of Kentucky declare—

"That the government created by this compact was not made the exclusive or final judge of the extent of the powers delegated to itself, since that would have made its discretion and not the constitution the measure of its powers; but that, as in all other cases of compact among parties having no common judge, each party has an equal right to judge for itself as well of infractions as of the mode and measure of redress."

At the ensuing session of the legislature the subject was re-examined, and on the 14th of November, 1799, the resolutions of the preceding year were deliberately reaffirmed, and it was among other things solemnly declared:

"That if those who administer the general government be permitted to transgress the limits fixed by that compact, by a total disregard to the special delegations of power therein

contained, an annihilation of the State governments and the erection upon their ruins of a general consolidated government will be the inevitable consequence. That the principles of construction contended for by sundry of the State legislatures, that the general government is the exclusive judge of the extent of the powers delegated to it, stop nothing short of despotism; since the discretion of those who administer the government, and not the constitution, would be the measure of their powers. That the several States who formed that instrument, being sovereign and independent, have the unquestionable right to judge of its infraction, and that a nullification, by those sovereignties, of all unauthorized acts done under color of that instrument, is the rightful remedy."

Time and experience confirmed Mr. Jefferson's opinion on this all-important point. In the year 1821 he expressed himself in this emphatic manner:

"It is a fatal heresy to suppose that either our State governments are superior to the federal or the federal to the State; neither is authorized literally to decide which belongs to itself or its copartner in government; in differences of opinion between their different sets of public servants the appeal is to neither, but to their employers peaceably assembled by their representatives in convention."

The opinion of Mr. Jefferson on this subject has been so repeatedly and so solemnly expressed that they may be said to have been among the most fixed and settled convictions of his mind.

In the protest prepared by him for the legislature of Virginia in December, 1825, in respect to the powers exercised by the federal government in relation to the tariff and internal improvements, which he declares to be "usurpations of the powers retained by the States, mere interpolations into the compact and direct infractions of it," he solemnly reasserts all the principles of the Virginia resolutions of '98—protests against "these acts of the federal branch of the government

as null and void, and declares that, although Virginia would consider a dissolution of the Union as among the greatest calamities that could befall them, yet it is not the greatest. There is one yet greater—submission to a government of unlimited powers. It is only when the hope of this shall become absolutely desperate that further forbearance could not be indulged."

In his letter to Mr. Giles, written about the same time, he says:

"I see, as you do, and with the deepest affliction, the rapid strides with which the federal branch of our government is advancing toward the usurpation of all the rights reserved to the States, and the consolidation in itself of all powers, foreign and domestic, and that too by constructions which leave no limits to their powers, etc. Under the power to regulate commerce they assume indefinitely that also over agriculture and manufactures, etc. Under the authority to establish post-roads they claim that of cutting down mountains for the construction of roads and digging canals, etc. And what is our resource for the preservation of the constitution? Reason and argument? You might as well reason and argue with the marble columns encircling them, etc. Are we then to stand to our arms with the hot-headed Georgian? No [and I say no, and South Carolina has said no], that must be the last resource. We must have patience and long endurance with our brethren, etc., and separate from our companions only when the sole alternatives left are a dissolution of our union with them or submission to a government without limitation of powers. Between these two evils, when we must make a choice, there can be no hesitation."

Such, sir, are the high and imposing authorities in support of "the Carolina doctrine," which is, in fact, the doctrine of the Virginia resolutions of 1798.

Sir, at that day the whole country was divided on this very question. It formed the line of demarcation between the federal and republican parties; and the great political revolu-

tion which then took place turned upon the very question involved in these resolutions. That question was decided by the people, and by that decision the constitution was, in the emphatic language of Mr. Jefferson, "saved at its last gasp."

I should suppose, sir, it would require more self-respect than any gentleman here would be willing to assume to treat lightly doctrines derived from such high resources. Resting on authority like this, I will ask gentlemen whether South Carolina has not manifested a high regard for the Union, when, under a tyranny ten times more grievous than the Alien and Sedition Laws, she has hitherto gone no further than to petition, remonstrate, and to solemnly protest against a series of measures which she believes to be wholly unconstitutional and utterly destructive of her interests. Sir, South Carolina has not gone one step further than Mr. Jefferson himself was disposed to go in relation to the present subject of our present complaints; not a step further than the statesmen from New England were disposed to go under similar circumstances; no further than the senator from Massachusetts himself once considered as within "the limits of a constitutional opposition." The doctrine that it is the right of a State to judge of the violations of the constitution on the part of the federal government and to protect her citizens from the operations of unconstitutional laws was held by the enlightened citizens of Boston who assembled in Faneuil Hall on the 25th of January, 1809. They state in that celebrated memorial that "they looked only to the State legislature, who were competent to devise relief against the unconstitutional acts of the general government. That your power (say they) is adequate to that object is evident from the organization of the confederacy."

A distinguished senator from one of the New England

States [Mr. Hillhouse], in a speech delivered here on a bill for enforcing the embargo declared:

"I feel myself bound in conscience to declare (lest the blood of those who shall fall in the execution of this measure shall be on my head) that I consider this to be an act which directs a mortal blow at the liberties of my country; an act containing unconstitutional provisions to which the people are not bound to submit, and to which in my opinion they will not submit."

And the senator from Massachusetts himself, in a speech delivered on the same subject in the other House, said:

"This opposition is constitutional and legal; it is also conscientious. It rests on settled and sober conviction that such policy is destructive to the interests of the people and dangerous to the being of government. The experience of every day confirms these sentiments. Men who act from such motives are not to be discouraged by trifling obstacles nor awed by any dangers. They know the limit of constitutional opposition; up to that limit, at their own discretion, they will walk, and walk fearlessly."

How "the being of the government" was to be endangered by "constitutional opposition" to the embargo I leave to the gentleman to explain.

Thus it will be seen, Mr. President, that the South Carolina doctrine is the republican doctrine of '98; that it was promulgated by the fathers of the faith; that it was maintained by Virginia and Kentucky in the worst of times; that it constituted the very pivot on which the political revolution of that day turned; that it embraces the very principles the triumph of which at that time saved the constitution at its last gasp, and which New England statesmen were not unwilling to adopt when they believed themselves to be the victims of unconstitutional legislation. Sir, as to the doctrine that the

federal government is the exclusive judge of the extent as well as the limitations of its powers, it seems to me to be utterly subversive of the sovereignty and independence of the States.

It makes but little difference in my estimation whether Congress or the Supreme Court are invested with this power. If the federal government in all or any of its departments is to prescribe the limits of its own authority, and the States are bound to submit to the decision and are not allowed to examine and decide for themselves when the barriers of the constitution shall be overleaped, this is practically "a government without limitation of powers."

The States are at once reduced to mere petty corporations and the people are entirely at your mercy. I have but one word more to add. In all the efforts that have been made by South Carolina to resist the unconstitutional laws which Congress has extended over them, she has kept steadily in view the preservation of the Union by the only means by which she believes it can be long preserved—a firm, manly, and steady resistance against usurpation.

The measures of the federal government have, it is true, prostrated her interests, and will soon involve the whole South in irretrievable ruin. But even this evil, great as it is, is not the chief ground of our complaints. It is the principle involved in the contest, a principle which, substituting the discretion of Congress for the limitations of the constitution, brings the States and the people to the feet of the federal government and leaves them nothing they can call their own.

Sir, if the measures of the federal government were less oppressive we should still strive against this usurpation. The South is acting on a principle she has always held sacred—resistance to unauthorized taxation.

These, sir, are the principles which induced the immortal Hampden to resist the payment of a tax of twenty shillings. Would twenty shillings have ruined his fortune? No! but the payment of half twenty shillings on the principle on which it was demanded would have made him a slave.

Sir, if in acting on these high motives, if animated by that ardent love of liberty which has always been the most prominent trait in the Southern character, we should be hurried beyond the bounds of a cold and calculating prudence, who is there with one noble and generous sentiment in his bosom that would not be disposed, in the language of Burke, to exclaim, "You must pardon something to the spirit of liberty!"[2]

VICTOR COUSIN

VICTOR COUSIN was born in Paris, in 1792. At the age of ten, he was sent to the secondary school named Lycée Charlemagne, a seminary of a rank analogous to that of a Prussian Gymnasium. Here he studied until he was eighteen, and then passed to the Normal School, an institution of the higher educational order corresponding to a first-class American university. In 1815–16 he became an assistant to Royer-Collard, who then occupied the chair of the history of modern philosophy. In 1817 he went to Germany, where he met Hegel and Schelling. In 1821–22, when a reaction against Liberalism occurred, he was deprived of his position in the Normal School; in fact, that institution itself was shortly swept away, though it was afterward revived. During the next seven years Cousin published a number of books in which he set forth what is distinctive in his doctrines, that is to say his eclecticism, his ontology and his philosophy of history. In 1828, he was recalled to the chair of philosophy at the Sorbonne, and delivered a series of lectures by which he acquired great distinction. The extracts, which are here reproduced, however, are made from the lectures which were delivered in 1818, and which in 1854 were revised and published under the title of "The True, the Beautiful and the Good." The most permanent service rendered by Cousin to his country was the organization of primary instruction, which he effected during the reign of Louis Philippe. We should mention that in 1832 he was made a peer of France, and in 1840 accepted the position of Minister of Instruction. He was also director of the Normal School and virtual head of the university, and from 1840 he was a member of the Institute. After the *coup d'état* of December 2, 1851, he was deprived of his position as permanent member of the Superior Council of Public Instruction, and henceforth lived in retirement until his death in 1867.

ELOQUENCE AS DISTINGUISHED FROM THE FINE ARTS

IT WILL, perhaps, seem strange that we rank among the arts neither eloquence, nor history, nor philosophy.

The arts are called the fine arts, because their sole object is to produce the disinterested emotion of beauty, without regard to the utility either of the spectator or the artist. They are also called the liberal arts, because they

are the arts of free men and not of slaves, which affranchise the soul, charm and ennoble existence; hence the sense and origin of those expressions of antiquity, *artes liberales*, *artes ingenuæ*. There are arts without nobility, whose end is practical and material utility; they are called trades, such as that of the stove-maker and the mason. True art may be joined to them, may even shine in them, but only in the accessories and the details.

Eloquence, history, philosophy, are certainly high employments of intelligence. They have their dignity, their eminence, which nothing surpasses; but rigorously speaking, they are not arts.

Eloquence does not propose to itself to produce in the soul of the auditors the disinterested sentiment of beauty. It may also produce this effect, but without having sought it. Its direct end, which it can subordinate to no other, is to convince, to persuade. Eloquence has a client which, before all, it must save or make triumph. It matters little whether this client be a man, a people, or an idea. Fortunate is the orator if he elicit the expression: That is beautiful! for it is a noble homage rendered to his talent: unfortunate is he if he does not elicit this, for he has missed his end. The two great types of political and religious eloquence, Demosthenes in antiquity, Bossuet among the moderns, think only of the interest of the cause confided to their genius, the sacred cause of country and that of religion, while at bottom Phidias and Raphael work to make beautiful things. Let us hasten to say, what the names of Demosthenes and Bossuet command us to say, that true eloquence, very different from that of rhetoric, disdains certain means of success. It asks no more than to please, but without any sacrifice unworthy

of it; every foreign ornament degrades it. Its proper character is simplicity, earnestness. I do not mean affected earnestness, a designed and artful gravity, the worst of all deceptions; I mean true earnestness, that springs from sincere and profound conviction. This is what Socrates understood by true eloquence.

As much must be said of history and philosophy. The philosopher speaks and writes. Can he, then, like the orator, find accents which make truth enter the soul; colors and forms that make it shine forth evident and manifest to the eyes of intelligence? It would be betraying his cause to neglect the means that can serve it; but the profoundest art is here only a means, the aim of philosophy is elsewhere; whence it follows that philosophy is not an art. Without doubt, Plato is a great artist; he is the peer of Sophocles and Phidias, as Pascal is sometimes the rival of Demosthenes and Bossuet; but both would have blushed if they had discovered at the bottom of their souls another design, another aim than the service of truth and virtue.

History does not relate for the sake of relating; it does not paint for the sake of painting; it relates and paints the past that it may be the living lesson of the future. It proposes to instruct new generations by the experience of those who have gone before them, by exhibiting to them a faithful picture of great and important events, with their causes and their effects, with general designs and particular passions, with the faults, virtues, and crimes that are found mingled together in human things. It teaches the excellence of prudence, courage, and great thoughts profoundly meditated, constantly pursued, and executed with moderation and force. It shows the vanity

of immoderate pretensions, the power of wisdom and virtue, the impotence of folly and crime. Thucydides, Polybius, and Tacitus undertake anything rather than procuring new emotions for an idle curiosity or a wornout imagination. They doubtless desire to interest and attract, but more to instruct; they are the avowed masters of statesmen and the preceptors of mankind.

The sole object of art is the beautiful. Art abandons itself as soon as it shuns this. It is often constrained to make concessions to circumstances, to external conditions that are imposed upon it; but it must always retain a just liberty. Architecture and the art of gardening are the least free of arts; they are subjected to unavoidable obstacles; it belongs to the genius of the artist to govern these obstacles, and even to draw from them happy effects, as the poet turns the slavery of metre and rhyme into a source of unexpected beauties. Extreme liberty may carry art to a caprice which degrades it, as chains too heavy crush it. It is the death of architecture to subject it to convenience, to comfort. Is the architect obliged to subordinate general effect and the proportions of the edifice to such or such a particular end that is prescribed to him? He takes refuge in details, in pediments, in friezes, in all the parts that have not utility for a special object, and in them he becomes a true artist. Sculpture and painting, especially music and poetry, are freer than architecture and the art of gardening. One can also shackle them, but they disengage themselves more easily.

Similar by their common end, all the arts differ by the particular effects which they produce, and by the processes which they employ. They gain nothing by exchanging their means and confounding the limits that separate

them. I bow before the authority of antiquity; but, perhaps, through habit and a remnant of prejudice, I have some difficulty in representing to myself with pleasure statues composed of several metals, especially painted statues. Without pretending that sculpture has not to a certain point its color, that of perfectly pure matter, that especially which the hand of time impresses upon it, in spite of all the seductions of a contemporaneous artist of great talent, I have little taste, I confess, for that artifice that is forced to give to marble the *morbidezza* of painting. Sculpture is an austere muse; it has its graces, but they are those of no other art. Flesh-color must remain a stranger to it. Nothing more would remain to communicate to it but the movement of poetry and the indefiniteness of music! And what will music gain by aiming at the picturesque, when its proper domain is the pathetic? Give to the most learned symphonist a storm to render. Nothing is easier to imitate than the whistling of the winds and the noise of thunder. But by what combinations of harmony will he exhibit to the eyes the glare of the lightning rending all of a sudden the veil of the night, and, what is most fearful in the tempest, the movement of the waves that now ascend like a mountain, now descend and seem to precipitate themselves into bottomless abysses? If the auditor is not informed of the subject, he will never suspect it, and I defy him to distinguish a tempest from a battle. In spite of science and genius, sounds cannot paint forms. Music, when well guided, will guard itself from contending against the impossible; it will not undertake to express the tumult and strife of the waves and other similar phenomena; it will do more: with sounds it will fill the soul with the sentiments that succeed each other

in us during the different scenes of the tempest. Haydn will thus become the rival, even the vanquisher of the painter, because it has been given to music to move and agitate the soul more profoundly than painting.

Since the "Laocoon" of Lessing, it is no longer permitted to repeat, without great reserve, the famous axiom —*Ut pictura poesis;* or, at least, it is very certain that painting cannot do everything that poetry can do. Everybody admires the picture of Rumor, drawn by Virgil; but let a painter try to realize this symbolic figure; let him represent to us a huge monster with a hundred eyes, a hundred mouths, and a hundred ears, whose feet touch the earth, whose head is lost in the clouds, and such a figure will become very ridiculous.

So the arts have a common end, and entirely different means. Hence the general rules common to all, and particular rules for each. I have neither time nor space to enter into details on this point. I limit myself to repeating that the great law which governs all others is expression. Every work of art that does not express an idea signifies nothing; in addressing itself to such or such a sense, it must penetrate to the mind, to the soul, and bear thither a thought, a sentiment capable of touching or elevating it. From this fundamental rule all the others are derived; for example, that which is continually and justly recommended—composition. To this is particularly applied the precept of unity and variety. But, in saying this, we have said nothing so long as we have not determined the nature of the unity of which we would speak. True unity is unity of expression, and variety is made only to spread over the entire work the idea or the single sentiment that it should express. It is useless to remark,

that between composition thus defined, and what is often called composition, as the symmetry and arrangement of parts according to artificial rules, there is an abyss. True composition is nothing else than the most powerful means of expression.

Expression not only furnishes the general rules of art, it also gives the principle that allows of their classification.

In fact, every classification supposes a principle that serves as a common measure.

Such a principle has been sought in pleasure, and the first of arts has seemed that which gives the most vivid joys. But we have proved that the object of art is not pleasure—the more or less of pleasure that an art procures cannot, then, be the true measure of its value.

This measure is nothing else than expression. Expression being the supreme end, the art that most nearly approaches it is the first of all.

All true arts are expressive, but they are diversely so. Take music; it is without contradiction the most penetrating, the profoundest, the most intimate art. There is physically and morally between a sound and the soul a marvellous relation. It seems as though the soul were an echo in which the sound takes a new power. Extraordinary things are recounted of the ancient music. And it must not be believed that the greatness of effect supposes here very complicated means. No, the less noise music makes, the more it touches. Give some notes to Pergolese, give him especially some pure and sweet voices, and he returns a celestial charm, bears you away into infinite spaces, plunges you into ineffable reveries. The peculiar power of music is to open to the imagination a limitless career, to lend itself with astonishing facility to all the

moods of each one, to arouse or calm, with the sounds of the simplest melody, our accustomed sentiments, our favorite affections. In this respect music is an art without a rival; however, it is not the first of arts. . . .

Between sculpture and music, those two opposite extremes, is painting, nearly as precise as the one, nearly as touching as the other. Like sculpture, it marks the visible forms of objects, but adds to them life; like music, it expresses the profoundest sentiments of the soul, and expresses them all. Tell me what sentiment does not come within the province of the painter? He has entire nature at his disposal, the physical world, and the moral world, a churchyard, a landscape, a sunset, the ocean, the great scenes of civil and religious life, all the beings of creation —above all, the figure of man, and its expression, that living mirror of what passes in the soul. More pathetic than sculpture, clearer than music, painting is elevated, in my opinion, above both, because it expresses beauty more under all its forms, and the human soul in all the richness and variety of its sentiments.

But the art *par excellence*, that which surpasses all others, because it is incomparably the most expressive, is poetry.

Speech is the instrument of poetry; poetry fashions it to its use, and idealizes it, in order to make it express ideal beauty. Poetry gives to it the charm and power of measure; it makes of it something intermediary between the ordinary voice and music—something at once material and immaterial, finite, clear, and precise—like contours and forms the most definite, living and animated; like color pathetic, and infinite like sound. A word in itself, especially a word chosen and transfigured by poetry, is the

most energetic and universal symbol. Armed with this talisman, poetry reflects all the images of the sensible world, like sculpture and painting; it reflects sentiment like painting and music, with all its varieties, which music does not attain, and in their rapid succession that painting cannot follow, as precise and immobile as sculpture; and it not only expresses all that; it expresses what is inaccessible to every other art—I mean thought, entirely distinct from the senses and even from sentiment—thought that has no forms—thought that has no color, that lets no sound escape, that does not manifest itself in any way—thought in its highest flight, in its most refined abstraction.

Think of it. What a world of images, of sentiments, of thoughts at once distinct and confused, are excited within us by this one word—country! and by this other word, brief and immense—God! What is more clear and altogether more profound and vast!

Tell the architect, the sculptor, the painter, even the musician, to call forth also by a single stroke all the powers of nature and the soul! They cannot, and by that they acknowledge the superiority of speech and poetry.

They proclaim it themselves, for they take poetry for their own measure; they esteem their own works, and demand that they should be esteemed, in proportion as they approach the poetical ideal. And the human race does as artists do: a beautiful picture, a noble melody, a living and expressive statue, gives rise to the exclamation, How poetical! This is not an arbitrary comparison; it is a natural judgment which makes poetry the type of the perfection of all the arts—the art *par excellence*, which comprises all others, to which they aspire, which none can reach.

When the other arts would imitate the works of poetry,

they usually err, losing their own genius, without robbing poetry of its genius. But poetry constructs, according to its own taste, palaces and temples, like architecture; it makes them simple or magnificent; all orders, as well as all systems, obey it; the different ages of art are the same to it; it reproduces, if it please, the Classic or the Gothic, the beautiful or the sublime, the measured or the infinite. Lessing has been able, with the exactest justice, to compare Homer to the most perfect sculptor; with such precision are the forms which that marvellous chisel gives to all beings determined! And what a painter, too, is Homer! And, of a different kind, Dante! Music alone has something more penetrating than poetry, but it is vague, limited, and fugitive. Besides its clearness, its variety, its durability, poetry has also the most pathetic accents. Call to mind the words that Priam utters at the feet of Achilles while asking him for the dead body of his son, more than one verse of Virgil, entire scenes of the "Cid" and the "Polyeucte," the prayer of Esther kneeling before the Lord, or the choruses of "Esther" and "Athalie." In the celebrated song of Pergolese, "Stabat Mater Dolorosa," we may ask which moves most, the music or the words. The "Dies Iræ, Dies Illa," recited only, produces the most terrible effect. In those fearful words, every blow tells, so to speak; each word contains a distinct sentiment, an idea at once profound and determinate. The intellect advances at each step, and the heart rushes on in its turn. Human speech, idealized by poetry, has the depth and brilliancy of musical notes; it is luminous as well as pathetic; it speaks to the mind as well as to the heart; it is in that inimitable, unique, and embraces all extremes and all contraries in a harmony that redoubles their reciprocal

effect—in which, by turns, appear and are developed all images, all sentiments, all ideas, all the human faculties, all the inmost recesses of the soul, all the forms of things, all real and all intelligible worlds!

LIBERTY

PASSIONS abandoning themselves to their caprices are anarchy. Passions concentrated upon a dominant passion are tyranny. Liberty consists in the struggle of will against this tyranny and this anarchy. But this combat must have an aim, and this aim is the duty of obeying reason, which is our true sovereign, and justice, which reason reveals to us and prescribes for us. The duty of obeying reason is the law of will, and will is never more itself than when it submits to its law. We do not possess ourselves as long as to the domination of desire, of passion, of interest, reason does not oppose the counterpoise of justice. Reason and justice free us from the yoke of passions, without imposing upon us another yoke. For, once more, to obey them is not to abdicate liberty, but to save it, to apply it to its legitimate use.

It is in liberty and in the agreement of liberty with reason and justice that man belongs to himself, to speak properly. He is a person only because he is a free being enlightened by reason.

What distinguishes a person from a simple thing is especially the difference between liberty and its opposite. A thing is that which is not free, consequently that which does not belong to itself, that which has no self, which has only a numerical individuality, a perfect effigy of true individuality, which is that of person.

A thing not belonging to itself belongs to the first person that takes possession of it and puts his mark on it.

A thing is not responsible for the movements which it has not willed, of which it is even ignorant. Person alone is responsible, for it is intelligent and free; and it is responsible for the use of its intelligence and freedom.

A thing has no dignity; dignity is only attached to person.

A thing has no value by itself; it has only that which person confers on it. It is purely an instrument whose whole value consists in the use that the person using it derives from it.

Obligation implies liberty; where liberty is not duty is wanting, and with duty right is wanting also.

It is because there is in me a being worthy of respect, that I have the duty of respecting it, and the right to make it respected by you. My duty is the exact measure of my right. The one is in direct ratio with the other. If I had no sacred duty to respect what makes my person, that is to say, my intelligence and my liberty, I should not have the right to defend it against your injuries. But as my person is inviolable and sacred in itself, it follows that, considered in relation to me, it imposes on me a duty, and considered in relation to you, it confers on me a right.

I am not myself permitted to degrade the person that I am by abandoning myself to passion, to vice, and to crime, and I am not permitted to let it be degraded by you.

The person is inviolable; and it alone is inviolable.

It is inviolable not only in the intimate sanctuary of

consciousness, but in all its legitimate manifestations, in its acts, in the product of its acts, even in the instruments that it makes its own by using them.

Therein is the foundation of the sanctity of property. The first property is the person. All other properties are derived from that. Think of it well. It is not property in itself that has rights, it is the proprietor, it is the person that stamps upon it, with its own character, its right and its title.

The person cannot cease to belong to itself, without degrading itself—it is to itself inalienable. The person has no right over itself; it cannot treat itself as a thing, cannot sell itself, cannot destroy itself, cannot in any way abolish its free will and its liberty, which are its constituent elements.

Why has the child already some rights? Because it will be a free being. Why have the old man, returned to infancy, and the insane man still some rights? Because they have been free beings. We even respect liberty in its first glimmerings or its last vestiges. Why, on the other hand, have the insane man and the imbecile old man no longer all their rights? Because they have lost liberty. Why do we enchain the furious madman? Because he has lost knowledge and liberty. Why is slavery an abominable institution? Because it is an outrage upon what constitutes humanity. This is the reason why, in fine, certain extreme devotions are sometimes sublime faults, and no one is permitted to offer them, much less to demand them. There is no legitimate devotion against the very essence of right, against liberty, against justice, against the dignity of the human person.

LAW

THERE is an education of liberty as well as our other faculties. It is sometimes in subduing the body, sometimes in governing our intelligence, especially in resisting our passions, that we learn to be free. We encounter opposition at each step—the only question is not to shun it. In this constant struggle liberty is formed and augmented, until it becomes a habit.

Finally, there is a culture of sensibility itself. Fortunate are those who have received from nature the sacred fire of enthusiasm! They ought religiously to preserve it. But there is no soul that does not conceal some fortunate vein of it. It is necessary to watch it and pursue, to avoid what restrains it, to seek what favors it, and, by an assiduous culture, draw from it, little by little, some treasures. If we cannot give ourselves sensibility, we can at least develop what we have. We can do this by giving ourselves up to it, by seizing all the occasions of giving ourselves up to it, by calling to its aid intelligence itself; for the more we know of the beautiful and the good, the more we love it. Sentiment thereby only borrows from intelligence what it returns with usury. Intelligence in its turn finds, in the heart, a rampart against sophism. Noble sentiments, nourished and developed, preserve from those sad systems that please certain spirits so much only because their hearts are so small.

Man would still have duties, should he cease to be in relation with other men. As long as he preserves any intelligence and any liberty, the idea of the good dwells

in him, and with it duty. Were we cast upon a desert island, duty would follow us thither. It would be beyond belief strange that it should be in the power of certain external circumstances to affranchise an intelligent and free being from all obligations toward his liberty and his intelligence. In the deepest solitude he is always and consciously under the empire of a law attached to the person itself, which, by obligating him to keep continual watch over himself, makes at once his torment and his grandeur.

If the moral person is sacred to me, it is not because it is in me—it is because it is the moral person. It is in itself respectable; it will be so, then, wherever we meet it.

It is in you as in me, and for the same reason. In relation to me it imposes on me a duty; in you it becomes the foundation of a right, and thereby imposes on me a new duty in relation to you.

I owe to you truth as I owe it to myself; for truth is the law of your reason as of mine. Without doubt there ought to be measure in the communication of truth—all are not capable of it at the same moment and in the same degree. It is necessary to portion it out to them in order that they may be able to receive it; but, in fine, the truth is the proper good of the intelligence; and it is for me a strict duty to respect the development of your mind, not to arrest, and even to favor its progress toward truth.

I ought also to respect your liberty. I have not even always the right to hinder you from committing a fault. Liberty is so sacred that, even when it goes astray, it still deserves, up to a certain point, to be managed. We are often wrong in wishing to prevent too much the evil that

God himself permits. Souls may be corrupted by an attempt to purify them.

I ought to respect you in your affections, which make part of yourself; and of all the affections there are none more holy than those of the family. There is in us a need of expanding ourselves beyond ourselves, yet without dispelling ourselves, of establishing ourselves in some souls by a regular and consecrated affection—to this need the family responds. The love of men is something of the general good. The family is still almost the individual, and not merely the individual—it only requires us to love as much as ourselves what is almost ourselves. It attaches one to the other, by the sweetest and strongest of all ties —father, mother, child; it gives to this sure succor in the love of its parents—to these hope, joy, new life, in their child. To violate the conjugal or paternal right is to violate the person in what is perhaps its most sacred possession.

I ought to respect your body, inasmuch as it belongs to you, inasmuch as it is the necessary instrument of your person. I have neither the right to kill you, nor to wound you, unless I am attacked and threatened; then my violated liberty is armed with a new right, the right of defence and even constraint.

I owe respect to your goods, for they are the product of your labor; I owe respect to your labor, which is your liberty itself in exercise; and, if your goods come from an inheritance, I still owe respect to the free will that has transmitted them to you.

Respect for the rights of others is called justice; every violation of a right is an injustice.

Every injustice is an encroachment upon our person—

to retrench the least of our rights is to diminish our moral person, is, at least, so far as that retrenchment goes, to abase us to the condition of a thing.

The greatest of all injustices, because it comprises all others, is slavery. Slavery is the subjecting of all the faculties of one man to the profit of another man. The slave develops his intelligence a little only in the interest of another—it is not for the purpose of enlightening him, but to render him more useful, that some exercise of mind is allowed him. The slave has not the liberty of his movements; he is attached to the soil, is sold with it, or he is chained to the person of a master. The slave should have no affection, he has no family, no wife, no children—he has a female and little ones. His activity does not belong to him, for the product of his labor is another's. But, that nothing may be wanting to slavery, it is necessary to go further—in the slave must be destroyed the inborn sentiment of liberty; in him must be extinguished all idea of right; for, as long as this idea subsists, slavery is uncertain, and to an odious power may respond the terrible right of insurrection, that last resort of the oppressed against the abuse of force.

Justice, respect for the person in everything that constitutes the person, is the first duty of man toward his fellowman. Is this duty the only one?

When we have respected the person of others, when we have neither restrained their liberty, nor smothered their intelligence, nor maltreated their body, nor outraged their family, nor injured their goods, are we able to say that we have fulfilled the whole law in regard to them? One who is unfortunate is suffering before us. Is our conscience satisfied, if we are able to bear witness to ourselves that

we have not contributed to his sufferings? No; something tells us that it is still good to give him bread, succor, consolation.

There is here an important distinction to be made. If you have remained hard and insensible at the sight of another's misery, conscience cries out against you; and yet this man who is suffering, who, perhaps, is ready to die, has not the least right over the least part of your fortune, were it immense; and, if he use violence for the purpose of wresting from you a single penny, he would commit a crime. We here meet a new order of duties that do not correspond to rights. Man may resort to force in order to make his rights respected; he cannot impose on another any sacrifice whatever. Justice respects or restores; charity gives, and gives freely.

Charity takes from us something in order to give it to our fellowmen. If it go so far as to inspire us to renounce our dearest interests, it is called devotedness.

It certainly cannot be said that to be charitable is not obligatory. But this obligation must not be regarded as precise, as inflexible as the obligation to be just. Charity is a sacrifice; and who can find the rule of sacrifice, the formula of self-renunciation? For justice, the formula is clear—to respect the rights of another. But charity knows neither rule nor limit. It transcends all obligation. Its beauty is precisely in its liberty.

POLITICS

TRUE politics does not depend on more or less well-directed historical researches into the profound night of a past forever vanished and of which no vestige subsists; it rests on the knowledge of human nature.

Wherever society is, wherever it was, it has for its foundations: First, The need that we have of our fellow-creatures, and the social instincts that man bears in himself; second, The permanent and indestructible idea and sentiment of justice and right.

Man, feeble and powerless when he is alone, profoundly feels the need that he has of the succor of his fellow-creatures in order to develop his faculties, to embellish his life, and even to preserve it. Without reflection, without convention, he claims the hand, the experience, the love of those whom he sees made like himself. The instinct of society is in the first cry of the child that calls for the mother's help without knowing that it has a mother, and in the eagerness of the mother to respond to the cries of the child. It is in the feelings for others that nature has put in us—pity, sympathy, benevolence. It is in the attraction of the sexes, in their union, in the love of parents for their children, and in the ties of every kind that these first ties engender. If Providence has attached so much sadness to solitude, so much charm to society, it is because society is indispensable for the preservation of man and for his happiness, for his intellect and moral development. But if need and instinct begin society, it is justice that completes it.

In the presence of another man, without any external

law, without any compact, it is sufficient that I know that he is a man, that is to say, that he is intelligent and free, in order to know that he has rights, and to know that I ought to respect his rights as he ought to respect mine. As he is no freer than I am, nor I than he, we recognize toward each other equal rights and equal duties. If he abuse his force to violate the equality of our rights, I know that I have the right to defend myself and make myself respected; and if a third party be found between us, without any personal interest in the quarrel, he knows that it is his right and his duty to use force in order to protect the feeble, and even to make the oppressor expiate his injustice by a chastisement. Therein is already seen entire society with its essential principles—justice, liberty, equality, government, and punishment.

Justice is the guaranty of liberty. True liberty does not consist in doing what we will, but in doing what we have a right to do. Liberty of passion and caprice would have for its consequence the enslavement of the weakest to the strongest, and the enslavement of the strongest themselves to their unbridled desires. Man is truly free in the interior of his consciousness only in resisting passion and obeying justice; therein, also, is the type of true social liberty. Nothing is falser than the opinion that society diminishes our mutual liberty; far from that, it secures it, develops it; what it suppresses is not liberty, it is its opposite, passion. Society no more injures liberty than justice, for society is nothing else than the very idea of justice realized.

In securing liberty, justice secures equality also. If men are unequal in physical force and intelligence, they are equal in so far as they are free beings, and conse-

quently equally worthy of respect. All men, when they bear the sacred character of the moral person, are to be respected, by the same title, and in the same degree.

The limit of liberty is in liberty itself; the limit of right is in duty. Liberty is to be respected, provided it injure not the liberty of another. I ought to let you do what you please, but on the condition that nothing which you do will injure my liberty. For then, in virtue of my right of liberty, I should regard myself as obligated to repress the aberrations of your will, in order to protect my own and that of others. Society guarantees the liberty of each one, and if one citizen attack that of another, he is arrested in the name of liberty. For example, religious liberty is sacred. You may, in the secret of consciousness, invent for yourself the most extravagant superstition; but if you wish publicly to inculcate an immoral worship, you threaten the liberty and reason of your citizens: such preaching is interdicted.

From the necessity of repressing springs the necessity of a constituted repressive force.

Rigorously, this force is in us; for, if I am unjustly attacked, I have the right to defend myself. But, in the first place, I may not be the strongest; in the second place, no one is an impartial judge in his own cause, and what I regard or give out as an act of legitimate defence may be an act of violence and oppression.

So the protection of the rights of each one demands an impartial and disinterested force that may be superior to all particular forces. This disinterested party, armed with the power necessary to secure and defend the liberty of all, is called government.

The right of government expresses the rights of all

and each. It is the right of personal defence transferred to a public force, to the profit of common liberty.

Government is not, then, a power distinct from and independent of society; it draws from society its whole force. It is not what it has seemed to two opposite schools of publicists—to those who sacrifice society to government—to those who consider government as the enemy of society. If government did not represent society, it would be only a material, illegitimate, and soon powerless force; and without government society would be a war of all against all. Society makes the moral power of government, as government makes the security of society. Pascal is wrong when he says that, not being able to make what is just powerful, men have made what is powerful just. Government, in principle at least, is precisely what Pascal desired—justice armed with force.

It is a sad and false political system that places society and government, authority and liberty, in opposition to each other, by making them come from two different sources, by presenting them as two contrary principles. I often hear the principle of authority spoken of as a principle apart, independent, deriving from itself its force and legitimacy, and consequently made to rule. No error is deeper and more dangerous. Thereby it is thought to confirm the principle of authority; far from that, from it is taken away its solidest foundation. Authority—that is to say, legitimate and moral authority—is nothing else than justice, and justice is nothing else than the respect of liberty; so that there is not therein two different and contrary opinions, but one and the same principle, of equal certainty and equal grandeur, under all its forms and in all its applications.

STEVENS

THADDEUS STEVENS, known as the "Great Commoner," was born at Danville, Vermont, in 1792. Having graduated from Dartmouth College, he removed to Pennsylvania in 1814, where he studied law and was admitted to the bar. He was a member of the State Legislature of Pennsylvania during five of the years 1833–41, and was a member of the State Constitutional Convention in 1836. Having removed to Lancaster, Pennsylvania, in 1842, he was elected to Congress as a Whig in 1848, and re-elected in 1850. During his term of office in the House of Representatives he opposed the compromise measures advocated by Henry Clay in 1850, especially the Fugitive Slave Law. Stevens practiced law at Lancaster from 1853 to 1858, when he was returned to Congress as a Republican, and served continuously in the popular branch thereof until his death in Washington in August, 1868. During the last nine years of his life he was one of the Republican leaders in the House of Representatives, and toward the end gained such distinction as to be the virtual dictator of that body. He was the principal champion of the reconstruction methods which were ultimately applied in the seceding States, and it was he who mainly organized the impeachment of President Johnson.

AGAINST WEBSTER AND NORTHERN COMPROMISERS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, JUNE 10, 1850

DANTE, by actual observation, makes hell consist of nine circles, the punishments of each increasing in intensity over the preceding. Those doomed to the first circle are much less afflicted than those in the ninth, where are tortured Lucifer and Judas Iscariot—and I trust, in the next edition, will be added, the traitors to liberty. But notwithstanding this difference in degree, all, from the first circle to the ninth, inclusive, is hell—cruel,

desolate, abhorred, horrible hell! If I might venture to make a suggestion, I would advise these reverend perverters of Scripture to devote their subtlety to what they have probably more interest in—to ascertaining and demonstrating (perhaps an accompanying map might be useful) the exact spot and location where the most comfort might be enjoyed—the coolest corner in the lake that burns with fire and brimstone!

But not only by honorable gentlemen in this House, and right honorable gentlemen in the other, but throughout the country, the friends of liberty are reproached as "transcendentalists and fanatics." Sir, I do not understand the terms in such connection. There can be no fanatics in the cause of genuine liberty. Fanaticism is excessive zeal. There may be, and have been, fanatics in false religion; in the bloody religion of the heathen. There are fanatics in superstition. But there can be no fanatics, however warm their zeal, in true religion, even although you sell your goods, and bestow your money on the poor, and go and follow your Master. There may be, and every hour shows around me, fanatics in the cause of false liberty —that infamous liberty which justifies human bondage; that liberty whose cornerstone is slavery. But there can be no fanaticism, however high the enthusiasm, in the cause of rational, universal liberty—the liberty of the Declaration of Independence.

This is the same censure which the Egyptian tyrant cast upon those old abolitionists, Moses and Aaron, when they "agitated" for freedom, and, in obedience to the command of God, bade him let the people go.

But we are told by these pretended advocates of liberty in both branches of Congress, that those who preach free-

dom here and elsewhere are the slave's worst enemies; that it makes the slaveholder increase their burdens and tighten their chaims; that more cruel laws are enacted since this agitation began in 1835. Sir, I am not satisfied that this is the fact. I will send to the clerk, and ask him to read a law of Virginia enacted more than fifty years before this agitation began. It is to be found in the sixth volume of "Hening's Statutes at Large of Virginia," published in 1819, "pursuant to an act of the General Assembly of Virginia, passed on the fifth day of February, 1808."

"Sec. xxiv. And that when any slave shall be notoriously guilty of going abroad in the night, or running away and laying out, and cannot be reclaimed from such disorderly courses by common methods of punishment, it shall be lawful for the county court, upon complaint and proof thereof to them made by the owner of such slave, to order and direct such punishment by dismembering, or any other way, not touching life, as the court shall think fit. And if such slave shall die by means of such dismembering, no forfeiture or punishment shall be thereby incurred."

I have had that law read to see if any gentleman can turn me to any more cruel laws passed since the "agitation." I did not read it myself, though found on the pages of Old Virginia's law books, lest it should make the modest gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Millson], and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Stanly], and his gray-headed negro, blush!

Mr. Bayly of Virginia—That law is repealed, or not now in force.

Mr. Stevens—Then I am glad that the agitation has produced some amelioration of your laws, although I still find it on your statute book.

But suppose it were true that the masters had become more severe; has it not been so with tyrants in every age? The nearer the oppressed is to freedom, and the more hopeful his struggles, the tighter the master rivets his chains. Moses and Aaron urged the emancipation of the enslaved Jews. Their master hardened his heart. Those fanatical abolitionists, guided by Heaven, agitated anew. Pharaoh increased the burden of the slaves. He required the same quantity of brick from them without straw, as when the straw had been found them. They were seen dispersed and wandering to gather stubble to make out their task. They failed, and were beaten with stripes. Moses was their worst enemy, according to these philanthropic gentlemen. Did the Lord think so, and command him to desist, lest he should injure them? No; he directed him to agitate again, and demand the abolition of slavery from the king himself. That great slaveholder still hardened his heart, and refused. The Lord visited him with successive plagues—lice, frogs, locusts, thick darkness—until, as the agitation grew higher, and the chains were tighter drawn, he smote the firstborn of every house in Egypt; nor did the slaveholder relax the grasp on his victims, until there was wailing throughout the whole land, over one dead in every family, from the king that sat on the throne to the captive in the dungeon. So I fear it will be in this land of wicked slavery. You have already among you what is equivalent to the lice and the locusts, that wither up every green thing where the foot of slavery treads. Beware of the final plague. And you, in the midst of slavery, who are willing to do justice to the people, take care that your works testify to the purity of your intentions, even at some cost. Take care that your

door-posts are sprinkled with the blood of sacrifice, that when the destroying angel goes forth, as go forth he will, he may pass you by.

Aside from the principle of Eternal Right, I will never consent to the admission of another slave State into the Union (unless bound to do so by some constitutional compact, and I know of none such), on account of the injustice of slave representation. By the Constitution, not only the States now in the Union, but all that may hereafter be admitted, are entitled to have their slaves represented in Congress, five slaves being counted equal to three white freemen. This is unjust to the free States, unless you allow them a representation in the compound ratio of persons and property. There are twenty-five gentlemen on this floor who are virtually the representatives of slaves alone, having not one free constituent. This is an outrage on every representative principle, which supposes that representatives have constituents, whose will they are bound to obey and whose interest they protect. . . .

I shall not now particularly refer to the features of the most extraordinary conspiracy against liberty in the Senate, called the Compromise Bill. If it should survive its puerperal fever, we shall have another opportunity of knocking the monster in the head. I pass over what is familiarly known as the "ten-million bribe," which was evidently inserted for no other purpose than to create public opinion on 'change, and carry the bill.

But it is proposed to propitiate Virginia by giving her two hundred million dollars out of the public treasury, the proceeds of the public lands. If this sum were to be given for the purpose of purchasing the freedom of her slaves, large as it is, it should have my hearty support. It is, I

think, at least fifty millions more than would pay for them all at a fair market price. But it is designed for no purpose of emancipation. The cool-headed, cool-hearted, philosophic author had no such "transcendental" object. It is to be specifically appropriated to exile her free people of color, and transport them from the land of their birth to the land of the stranger! Sir, this is a proposition not "fit to be made."

Mr. Averett of Virginia here asked: Did not New England sell slaves?

Mr. Stevens—Yes, she sold, she imported slaves; she was very wicked; she has long since repented. Go ye and do likewise.

It is my purpose nowhere in these remarks to make personal reproaches; I entertain no ill-will toward any human being, nor any brute, that I know of, not even the skunk across the way, to which I referred. Least of all would I reproach the South. I honor her courage and fidelity. Even in a bad, a wicked cause, she shows a united front. All her sons are faithful to the cause of human bondage, because it is their cause. But the North—the poor, timid, mercenary, drivelling North—has no such united defenders of her cause, although it is the cause of human liberty. None of the bright lights of the nation shine upon her section. Even her own great men have turned her accusers. She is the victim of low ambition—an ambition which prefers self to country, personal aggrandizement to the high cause of human liberty. She is offered up a sacrifice to propitiate Southern tyranny—to conciliate Southern treason.

We are told that she has not done her duty in restoring fugitive slaves, and that more stringent laws must be passed

to secure that object. A distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Clay] says it is the duty, not only of officers in the free States, but of all the people who happen to be present, to give active aid to the slaveowner to run down, arrest, and restore the man who is fleeing from slavery. An equally distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Webster] unites with him in denouncing the aggressions of the North in this particular; and they both declare their determination to vote for the bill, with its amendments, now on file, and which has become a part of the "Compromise."

It may be well to look a little at the law as it now stands on the subject, and then at the one which has enlisted such powerful support. By the Constitution alone, without any legislation, the slaveholder may go into a free State, take with him such force as he pleases, and take his slave and carry him back. If the fact of his slavery be disputed, either by the alleged slave or any one for him, the claimant may issue his writ *de homine repligiando*, and unless the defendant give ample bail for his forthcoming on the final issue, and for the payment of all costs and damages (which include the value of his services in the meantime), the plaintiff may take him into his possession, and retain him until final trial by a court and jury. Is not this sufficient? It is all the right which he would have if he claimed property in a horse or other property which he might allege had strayed over the line. Why should he have any greater right when he claims property in man? Is a man of so much less value than a horse, that he should be deprived of the ordinary protection of the law? Sir, in my judgment, the remedy ought to be left where the Constitution places it, without any legislation. The odious law of 1793 ought to be repealed.

By that law, the slaveholder may not only seize his slave and drag him back, but he may command the aid of all the officers of the United States Court; take his alleged slave before the judge, and after summary examination, without trial by jury, may obtain a certificate of property; which, for the purpose of removal, is conclusive of his slavery, takes away the writ of Habeas Corpus, and the right of trial by jury, and sends the victim to hopeless bondage. If an inhabitant of a free State see a wretched fugitive, who he learns is fleeing from bondage, and gives him a meal of victuals to keep him from starving, and allows him to sleep in his outhouse, although his master is not in pursuit of him, he is liable to the penalty of five hundred dollars. A judge in Pennsylvania lately held that a worthy citizen of Indiana County incurred such penalty by giving a cup of water and a crust of bread to a famishing man whom he knew to be fleeing from bondage. A slave family escaped from Maryland, went into Cumberland County, Pennsylvania, and obtained the reluctant consent of a worthy farmer to sleep in his hayloft. Their owner did not pursue them for a week afterward. It was held by a State court that the farmer was liable for the full value of the slaves, besides the five hundred dollars penalty, and a jury returned a verdict for two thousand dollars and costs. Such are some of the provisions of the law of 1793 now in force, which these great expounders of constitutional freedom hold to be too mild! And more stringent laws are to be passed to punish Northern men who have hearts! . . .

The distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Clay] wishes further to make it the duty of all bystanders to aid in the capture of fugitives; to join the chase and run down the prey. This is asking more than my constituents will

ever grant. They will strictly abide by the Constitution. The slaveholder may pursue his slave among them with his own foreign myrmidons, unmolested, except by their frowning scorn. But no law that tyranny can pass will ever induce them to join the hue and cry after the trembling wretch who has escaped from unjust bondage. Their fair land, made by nature and their own honest toil as fertile and as lovely as the vale of Tempe, shall never become the hunting-ground on which the bloodhounds of slavery shall course their prey, and command them to join the hunt.

Sir, this tribunal would be more odious than the Star Chamber—these officers more hateful than the Familiars of the Inquisition.

Can the free North stand this? Can New England stand it? Can Massachusetts stand it? If she can, she has but one step further to take in degradation, and that is to deliver her own sons in chains to Southern masters! What would the bold Barons of Runnymede have said to such defenders of liberty? What would the advocates of English freedom, at any time, have said to those who would strike down the writ of Habeas Corpus and the right of trial by jury, those vital principles of Magna Charta and the Bill of Rights? They would have driven them forth as enemies in disguise.

Sir, I am aware of the temerity of these remarks. I know how little effect they will have, coming from so obscure a quarter, and being opposed by the mighty influences that create public opinion. I was struck with the sound sense of the remark made to-day by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Gentry]. He said that the "Compromise" Bill was winning favor with the people, most of whom had never

read it, merely because it is advocated by great names in whom they are accustomed to confide.

Late events have convinced me that it were better in republican, representative governments, where the people are to judge and decide on every measure, if there were no great, overshadowing names, to give factitious force to their views, and lead the public mind captive. If the people were to put faith in no man's argument, they would examine every question for themselves, and decide according to their intrinsic merit. The errors of the small do but little harm; those of the great are fatal. Had Lucifer been but a common angel, instead of the Chief of the morning stars, he had not taken with him to perdition the third of the heavenly hosts, and spread disunion and discord in celestial, and sin and misery in earthly, places.

Sir, so long as man is vain and fallible, so long as great men have like passions with others, and, as in republics, are surrounded with stronger temptations, it were better for themselves if their fame acquired no inordinate height, until the grave had precluded error. The errors of obscure men die with them, and cast no shame on their posterity. How different with the Great!

How much better had it been for Lord Bacon, that greatest of human intellects, had he never, during his life, acquired glory, and risen to high honors in the State, than to be degraded from them by the judgment of his peers. How much better for him and his, had he lived and died unknown, than to be branded through all future time as the

"Wisest, brightest, meanest of mankind."

So now, in this crisis of the fate of liberty, if any of the renowned men of this nation should betray her cause, it

were better that they had been unknown to fame. It need not be hoped that the brightness of their past glory will dazzle the eyes of posterity, or illumine the pages of impartial history. A few of its rays may still linger on a fading sky; but they will soon be whelmed in the blackness of darkness. For, unless progressive civilization, and the increasing love of freedom throughout the Christian and civilized world, are fallacious, the Sun of Liberty, of universal Liberty, is already above the horizon, and fast coursing to his meridian splendor, when no advocate of slavery, no apologist of slavery, can look upon his face and live.

THE ISSUE AGAINST ANDREW JOHNSON

ON THE FIRST RECONSTRUCTION BILL; DELIVERED IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, JANUARY 3, 1867

Mr. Speaker:

WHAT are the great questions which now divide the nation? In the midst of the political Babel which has been produced by the intermingling of secessionists, rebels, pardoned traitors, hissing Copperheads, and apostate Republicans, such a confusion of tongues is heard that it is difficult to understand either the questions that are asked or the answers that are given. Ask what is the "President's policy," and it is difficult to define it. Ask what is the "policy of Congress," and the answer is not always at hand. A few moments may be profitably spent in seeking the meaning of each of these terms.

In this country the whole sovereignty rests with the people, and is exercised through their representatives in Congress assembled. The legislative power is the sole guardian

of that sovereignty. No other branch of the government, no other department, no other officer of the government, possesses one single particle of the sovereignty of the nation. No government official, from the President and Chief-Justice down, can do any one act which is not prescribed and directed by the legislative power. . . .

Since, then, the President cannot enact, alter, or modify a single law; cannot even create a petty office within his own sphere of operations; if, in short, he is the mere servant of the people, who issue their commands to him through Congress, whence does he derive the constitutional power to create new States, to remodel old ones, to dictate organic laws, to fix the qualifications of voters, to declare that States are republican and entitled to command Congress to admit their Representatives? To my mind it is either the most ignorant and shallow mistake of his duties, or the most brazen and impudent usurpation of power. It is claimed for him by some as Commander-in-Chief of the army and navy. How absurd that a mere executive officer should claim creative powers. Though Commander-in-Chief by the Constitution, he would have nothing to command, either by land or water, until Congress raised both army and navy. Congress also prescribes the rules and regulations to govern the army; even that is not left to the Commander-in-Chief.

Though the President is Commander-in-Chief, Congress is his commander; and, God willing, he shall obey. . . .

There are several good reasons for the passage of this bill. In the first place, it is just. I am now confining my argument to negro suffrage in the rebel States. Have not loyal blacks quite as good a right to choose rulers and make laws as rebel whites? In the second place, it is a neces

sity in order to protect the loyal white men in the seceded States. With them the blacks would act in a body; and it is believed then, in each of said States, except one, the two united would form a majority, control the States, and protect themselves. Now they are the victims of daily murder. They must suffer constant persecution, or be exiled.

Another good reason is that it would insure the ascendency of the Union party. "Do you avow the party purpose?" exclaims some horror-stricken demagogue. I do. For I believe, on my conscience, that on the continued ascendency of that party depends the safety of this great nation. If impartial suffrage is excluded in the rebel States, then every one of them is sure to send a solid rebel representation to Congress, and cast a solid rebel electoral vote. They, with their kindred Copperheads of the North, would always elect the President and control Congress. While Slavery sat upon her defiant throne, and insulted and intimidated the trembling North, the South frequently divided on questions of policy between Whigs and Democrats, and gave victory alternately to the sections. Now, you must divide them between loyalists, without regard to color, and disloyalists, or you will be the perpetual vassals of the free trade, irritated, revengeful South. For these, among other reasons, I am for negro suffrage in every rebel State. If it be just, it should not be denied; if it be necessary, it should be adopted; if it be a punishment to traitors, they deserve it.

DALLAS

GEORGE MIFFLIN DALLAS, an American statesman, was born in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, July 10, 1792, and died there, December 31, 1864. He was a son of A. J. Dallas, the secretary of the treasury during the administration of Madison. He was educated at Princeton College, studied law with his father, and after his admission to the bar at twenty-one was for a year private secretary to Gallatin during his mission to Russia. Dallas took a lively interest in political affairs, supporting Jackson for the presidency in 1824 and again in 1828, and after Jackson's inauguration in 1829 was appointed attorney-general for Philadelphia. He sat in Congress as senator, 1831-33, was attorney-general of his State, 1833-35, and minister to Russia, 1837-39. In 1844 he was elected vice-president of the United States, and as such, on the occasion of the senatorial tie in 1846 on the tariff question, gave the casting vote for low tariff. From 1856 to 1861 Dallas was minister to Great Britain, but retired to private life on his return to America in May, 1861. A number of his speeches were printed singly, and his "Series of Letters from London" appeared in 1869. His "Diary While United States Minister to Russia, 1837-39, and to England, 1856-61," appeared in 1892.

EULOGY ON ANDREW JACKSON

DELIVERED AT PHILADELPHIA, JUNE 26, 1845

FELLOW CITIZENS AND FRIENDS,—The sorrows of a nation on the loss of a great and good man are alike confirmed and assuaged by recurring to the virtues and services which endeared him. While funeral solemnities such as are now in progress attest the pervading regrets of communities, and swelling tears betray the anguish of individual friendship; while the muffled drum, the shrouded ensign, and the silent march of mingled processions of citizens and soldiery address their impressive force to the hearts of all, it is well to seek solace in remembrances which must brighten forever the annals of our country, and which add more to the list of names whose mere utterance exalts the pride and strengthens the foundations of patriotism.

At the epoch when, in September, 1774, the delegates of

eleven colonies assembled at our Carpenters' Hall before the first gun was fired at Lexington in the cause of western liberty, or Washington was yet hailed as "General and Commander-in-Chief," there could be seen in the wilds of the Waxhaw settlement in South Carolina, on a farm in dangerous proximity to Indian tribes, and clustering with two elder brothers around a widowed mother, a boy about eight years of age in whose veins coursed the same gallant blood that shortly after gushed from the wounds of Montgomery into the trenches of Quebec: that boy, molded in the spirit of those stern times, clinging with his whole soul to the American people, ripened into athletic manhood, enfeebled by toil, by disease, and by age—is just now dead; and you have invited me to pronounce over his yet loose grave the tribute of your affectionate gratitude and veneration; to soothe you by reminding you of the attributes and exploits of one who lived through all your heroic history and was himself an inseparable part of it; who was born on your soil when in fact it was a mere margin of eastern coast, and had sunk into it when a continent; who knew you when but two millions of scattered, weak, dependent, and disquieted provincialists, and yet saw you, ere he ceased to know you, an immense, united, powerful, and peaceful nation! It is impossible on the present occasion and with short notice to do justice to a task so protracted, complicate, and ennobling; but there are incidents and sentiments connected with the character and career of Andrew Jackson with which his countrymen unanimously sympathize, and which his public obsequies seem as appropriately as irresistibly to call into expression.

The stripling orphan, while mourning over the loss of kindred, smarting under wounds and imprisonment, and hourly witnessing some new cruelty committed upon friends and

neighbors, imbibed during the storms of our revolution a deep, uncompromising, almost fierce love of country that never lost its sway over his actions. It became to him an impulse as instinctive and irrepressible as breathing, and cannot but be regarded by those who trace his eventful existence as the master-passion of his nature. He passed through the war of 1776, in all but that too youthful for his trials; nor was there ever a moment in his after-being when this devotion can be said to have waned or slumbered in his breast.

Such a trait, so pure, so ardent, so unvarying—as fresh three weeks ago as seventy years before—as prompt and eager amid the frosts of age as when in the spring of life it first kindled at the voice of Washington—invokes, now that the door of his sepulchre is closed, undissembled and undissenting praise. It is this quality of moral excellence which forms the basis of his fame as it was the stimulant to every achievement.

From his fight under Davie with Bryan's regiment of Tories in 1780, when scarcely thirteen years of age, down to the close of his remarkable campaign in Florida when fifty-two, and thenceforward through all the diplomatic conflicts with foreign powers, it shone with steady intensity.

The peace of 1783 found him the only survivor of his family; left as it were alone to face the snares of the world uneducated and still a boy. His small patrimony melted away before he could check the reckless and prodigal habits to which he had been trained by eight years of wild and desperate strife. There was no one to counsel or to guide him; no one to inculcate lessons of prudence; no one to lead him into the paths of useful industry and of restored tranquility—but Jackson wanted no one.

At this, perhaps the most critical period of his life, the "iron will" subsequently attributed to his treatment of others was nobly exercised in governing himself. Energetically entering upon the study of the law, the native force of his intellect enabled him, soon after attaining his majority, not merely to preserve his personal independence but to carve his way to recognized distinction. The sphere of his professional practice, the western district of North Carolina, now the State of Tennessee, exacted labors and teemed with dangers such only as a resolution like his could encounter and surmount.

Infested with enraged Cherokees and Choctaws, its wilderness of two hundred miles, crossed and recrossed by the undaunted public solicitor more than twenty times, inured him to fatigue, to the sense of life constantly in peril, and to attacks and artifices of savage enemies whom he was destined signally to subdue and disperse.

It cannot be necessary to pursue these details further; no doubt it will be recollected that after aiding to form a constitution for the State he has made illustrious General Jackson at the age of thirty became her first and only representative in Congress, was almost immediately transferred in November, 1797, to the Senate of the United States, and, unwilling to prolong his legislative services, became a judge of the Supreme Court of Tennessee.

In all these elevated stations, and especially in the last, his sagacious mind, directed by motives at once pure and lofty and sustained by a spirit of unconquerable firmness, has left monuments of practical wisdom and usefulness in maintaining the rights and ameliorating the condition of his countrymen which time cannot efface.

When the prolonged aggressions of Great Britain upon the

maritime rights, commerce, and honor of America, prompted, in 1812, a declaration of hostilities, our hero, though watchful of events and keenly alive to their bearing, had retired from public activity and was engaged in the calm pursuits of agricultural life. That signal sounded with welcome in his seclusion and summoned him to a deathless renown. It came to his quick ear like a long-wished-for permit to avenge the wrongs and re-establish the sullied name of those for whom he was ever ready to sacrifice without stint his repose, his fortune, and his blood.

The warcry of his country scarcely vibrated on the breeze ere he echoed it back as a music with which every chord of his soul was in unison. In less than a week, leaving his plough in its yet opening furrow and his ripe harvest drooping for the sickle, he stood equipped and eager, in front of two thousand five hundred volunteers, awaiting orders from the chief executive.

I must not, I dare not, quit the singleness of my subject to indulge in reminiscences but partially connected with it, however alluring. Yet had the great and generous champion whom we lament a host of associates, competitors with him in the proud struggle of which would risk most, suffer most, and achieve most, in exemplifying the prowess, securing the safety, and exalting the reputation of their country. That, indeed, may be considered as in itself an ample eulogium upon human merit which depicts him as in the van of a roll emblazoned by such names as Scott, Harrison, Brown, Shelby, Johnson, Gaines, Ripley, Hull, Decatur, Perry, and McDonough.

Most of these have gone to graves over which are blooming in unfading verdure the laurels our gratitude planted. None of them can present to posterity a title to immortal honor

more conclusive than that involved in their having shared with Jackson the glories of 1812.

There are some fields of public service from which ordinary patriotism not unusually recoils, and of this kind is military action against the comparatively weak yet fierce and wily tribes of savages still occupying parts of their original domain on our continent. Unregulated by the principles of civilized warfare, Indian campaigns and conflicts are accompanied by constant scenes of revolting and unnecessary cruelty. Neither age nor sex nor condition is spared; havoc and destruction are the only ends at which the tomahawk, once brandished, can be stayed.

In exact proportion, however, to the horrors of such a system is the necessity of perfecting those of our people exposed to it by the most prompt and decisive resorts. When, in the midst of the great struggle with a European monarchy, the frontiers of Georgia and Tennessee were suddenly assailed by ferocious Creeks, all eyes turned, appealing with confidence for security, to him who was known to the foe themselves by the descriptive designations of "Long Arrow" and "Sharp Knife." No one, indeed, exhibited in higher perfection the two qualities essential to such a contest—sagacity and courage.

The sagacity of General Jackson was the admiration of the sophist and the wonder of the savage; it unravelled the meshes of both without the slightest seeming effort. Piercing through every subtlety or stratagem it attained the truth with electrical rapidity. It detected at a glance the toils of an adversary and discerned the mode by which these toils could best be baffled.

His courage was equally finished and faultless; quick but cool; easily aroused but never boisterous; concentrated, en-

during, and manly. No enemy could intimidate, no dangers fright him; no surprise shook his presence of mind as no emergency transcended his self-control. The red braves of the wilderness confessed that in these, their highest virtues, General Jackson equalled the most celebrated of their chiefs. Invoked to the rescue, he roused from a bed of suffering and debility among the terrified fugitives, addressing them with brief but animating exhortation: "Your frontier is threatened with invasion by the savage foe. Already are they marching to your borders with their scalping-knives unsheathed to butcher your women and children. Time is not to be lost. We must hasten to the frontier or we shall find it drenched with the blood of our citizens. The health of your general is restored; he will command in person."

It was the progress of this exhibition in regions at once desolated and unproductive, that this patient and persevering fortitude overcame obstacles of appalling magnitude; and here it was that, with touching kindness, when suffering the cravings of famine, he offered to divide with one of his own soldiers the handful of acorns he had secretly hoarded! The three victories of Talledega, Emuckfaw and Enotochopco, purchased with incredible fatigue, exposure, and loss of life, are not only to be valued in reference to the population and territory they pacified and redeemed, but as having disclosed, just in time for the crises of the main war, the transcendent ability and fitness of him who was destined to stamp its close with an exploit of unrivalled heroism and consummate generalship.

Shall I abruptly recall the battle of New Orleans?—recall, did I say? Is it ever absent from the memory of an American? Mingled indissolubly with the thought of country it springs to mind as Thermopylæ or Marathon when Greece is

named. He who gave that battle with all its splendid preliminaries and results to our chronicles of national valor may cease to be mortal but can never cease to be renowned. He may have a grave, but, like the Father of his Country, he can want no monument but posterity.

The judgment of the world has been irreversibly passed upon that extraordinary achievement of our republican soldier. Analyzed in all its plans, its means, its motives, and its execution; the genius that conceived, the patriotism that impelled, the boldness that never backed, nor paused, nor counted; the skill which trebled every resource, the activity that was everywhere, the end that accomplished everything. It was a masterpiece of work which Cæsar, William Tell, Napoleon, and Washington, could unite in applauding. Even the vanquished, soothed by the magnanimity of their victor, have since laid the tribute of their admiration at his feet. For that battle, in itself and alone, as now passed into the imperishable records of history, an exhaustless fund of moral property, our descendants in distant ages will teach their children, as they imbibe heroism from illustration and example, to murmur their blessings.

I have dwelt, fellow citizens, with perhaps unnecessary length upon the martial merits of the deceased. I have done so because these merits are incontestable, and form, apart from every other consideration, an overwhelming claim to the veneration and gratitude we are now displaying. To me personally, as you all know, it would be alike consistent and natural to go much farther; but, entertaining a real deference for the sentiments of others, I should be unable to pardon myself if on an occasion so peculiarly solemn a single word fell from my lips which did not chime with the tone of every bosom present. The time has not come, and among a free,

fearless, and frank people such as you are, it may possibly never come, when the civic characteristics of Jackson during his chief magistracy of eight years can be other than topics of sincere differences of opinion.

Springing, however, directly from what I have considered as the great root of his public services is at least one branch of his executive policy and action that need not be avoided. If as a Revolutionary lad he clung to the cause of the colonists; if as a soldier he knew no shrinking from his flag; as a president of these States he stood without budging on the rock of their union. It seemed as if, to him, that was hallowed ground, ungenial to the weeds of party, identical indeed with country. Count the cost of this confederacy, and he was scornfully silent; speak of disregarding her laws, and his remonstrances were vehement; move but a hair's breadth to end the compact, and he was in arms. On this vast concern, involving, directly or remotely, all the precious objects of American civilization, his zeal was as uncompromising, perhaps as unrefining and undiscriminating, as his convictions were profound. The extent of our obligation to him in regard to it cannot well be exaggerated. Possessing in his high office the opportunity, he gave to his purpose an impetus and an emphasis that will keep forever ringing in the ears of his successors—"The Union must and shall be preserved!"

Such was the hero we mourn. With a constitution undermined by privations incident to his military labors, and a frame shattered by diseases, he had retired to the seclusion of the Hermitage, long and patiently awaiting the only and final relief from suffering. It came to him on the evening of the 8th instant, in the centre of his home's affectionate circle, while his great mind was calm and unclouded and when his heart was prepared to welcome its dilatory messenger. Yes!

Yes! he on whom for half a century his country gazed as upon a tower of strength; on whom she never called for succor against the desolating savage without being answered by a rushing shout of "Onward to the rescue!"—who anticipated her invading foes by destroying them ere their footprints on her soil were cold—he, the iron warrior, the reproachless patriot, has ceased to be mortal, has willingly made his single surrender—*the* surrender—the surrender of his soul to its Almighty claimant!

It may almost be said that General Jackson was constituted of two natures, so admirably and so distinctly were his qualities adapted to their respective spheres of action. I have portrayed hurriedly and crudely his public character—let us for an instant see him, on one or two points at least, in the other aspect, and perhaps we may thence catch the secret of his sublime and beautiful death. The rugged exterior which rough wars in our early western settlements would naturally impart was smoothed and polished in him by a spirit of benevolence deeply seated in his temperament. In social intercourse, though always earnest, rapid, impressive, and upright, his friendship was marked by boundless confidence and generosity; while in domestic life a winning gentleness seemed to spread from the recesses of his heart over the whole man, filling the scenes around him with smiles of serenity and joy. No husband loved more ardently, more faithfully, more unchangeably; no parent could surpass the self-sacrificing kindness with which he reared and cherished his adopted children; no master could be more certain of reciprocated fondness than he was, when, as expiring, he breathed the hope of hereafter meeting in the heaven to which he was hastening the servants of his household, "as well black as white." The truthfulness of this picture is attested by all who were admitted

to the sanctuary of his home, precincts too sacred, even on an occasion equally sacred, for more than this brief intrusion.

But there was a crowning characteristic, from adverting to which I must not shrink, though in the presence in which I stand. General Jackson was fervently, unaffectedly, and submissively pious! Wherever he might be and whatever his absorbing pursuit—wading heavily through the swamps of Florida on the tracks of Hillishago; speeding with the swoop of an eagle to grapple the invader, Pakenham; careering at the head of his victorious legions through throngs of admiring countrymen; in the halls of the executive mansion; or at his hearth in the Hermitage; there and then, everywhere and always, though not ostensible and never obtrusive, his faith was with him. But it was most closely and conspicuously with him as dissolution approached; it was with him to brighten the rays of his mind, to cheer the throbs of his heart, to take the sting from his latest pang, and to give melody to his last farewell. The dying hour of Jackson bears triumphant testimony to the Christian's hope.

"Such was the hero; such was the man we mourn!"

Come, then, my countrymen! let us, as it were, gather round the depository of his remains! From those who knew him as it has been my lot to know him the frequent tear of cherished and proud remembrance must fall. To all of us it will be some relief to join in the simple and sacred sentiment of public gratitude.

"How sleep the brave who sink to rest,
By all their country's honors blest!
When Spring, with dewy fingers cold,
Returns to seek their hallowed mold,
She there shall dress a sweeter sod
Than fancy's feet have ever trod;
By fairy forms their dirge is sung—
By hands unseen their knell is rung;—
There honor comes, a pilgrim gray,
To bless the turf that wraps their clay:
And freedom shall awhile repair

IRVING

EDWARD IRVING, a noted Scottish religious leader and brilliant pulpit orator, was born at Annan, Scotland, August 4, 1792. He was educated at Edinburgh University and was licensed to preach in the Presbyterian ministry in 1815. Not far from this time he met Thomas Carlyle, and the two men became very close friends, Irving contributing greatly to the other's intellectual development, as Carlyle afterwards acknowledged. Irving had already become acquainted with Jane Welsh, and the two appear to have fallen in love with each other, but Irving was bound by a former engagement and Miss Welsh subsequently married Carlyle, who had been introduced to her by Irving. From 1819 to 1822 Irving was assistant to Chalmers in Glasgow, but removed to London in the latter year to become the pastor of an obscure Presbyterian congregation in Hatton Garden. Here his remarkable eloquence made an instantaneous impression and the little chapel was crowded Sunday after Sunday with the most notable persons in London society. At this time a general revival of religious interest was manifested in Great Britain, and especial attention was being given to the supposed fulfilment of Biblical prophecy. Irving was a leader in this study and in 1825 published "Babylon and Infidelity Foredoomed," and a translation from the Spanish of Lacuza's "Coming of the Messiah in Glory and Majesty," 1827. In the next year appeared his "Lectures on Baptism," in which a close approach was made to the position of the sacramentarians in the Established Church. Irving's fame had in the meantime transformed his small and poor congregation into a large and prosperous one, and a new church was built in Regent Square, where for a time a thousand persons assembled every Sunday to listen to his sermons. In the spring of 1828 he made a tour in Scotland to proclaim the near approach of the Second Advent of Christ, and at Edinburgh persons gathered to hear his lectures at five in the morning. His "Sermons on the Trinity," published that same year, gave rise to murmurs of heresy which were strengthened in 1830 by his tract "The Orthodox and Catholic Doctrine of Our Lord's Human Nature." The encouragement in his congregation of unintelligible rhapsodies as utterances of the Spirit, and alleged misstatements of doctrine, led to his ejection by the Presbytery on the charge of heresy in 1832. His followers now assembled in a chapel on Newman Street in London, and he remained their "angel" or pastor until his death at Glasgow, December 8, 1834. He was buried in Glasgow cathedral. Since his death the "Irvingite" church, as it is popularly called, has much increased in numbers, and at the principal church of the denomination in Gordon Square, London, the service is of the most ornate and elaborate character. Irving's works in five volumes appeared in 1865.

THE LORD JESUS CHRIST

"And from the Lord Jesus Christ."—Eph. 1, 2.

THE grace and peace with which Paul the apostle of Jesus Christ doth bless the saints at Ephesus and the faithful in Christ Jesus proceedeth not from God the Father only, but equally and alike from the Lord Jesus Christ; and this same conjunction of the Father and the Son as the source and origin of all spiritual benefits our apostle maketh not in one, but in all his epistles, and not he only, but also the other apostles.

We may never doubt, therefore, from this the constant style of holy Scripture, that the two Divine Persons thus advanced into equal honor as the fountain of grace and peace are to be equally acknowledged by the Church and witnessed to by the saints; that they may not and cannot be separated or contemplated apart: "No man knoweth the Son but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father save the Son, and he to whom the Son shall reveal him." Therefore the gospel is by our apostle called "the mystery of God, and [both] of the Father, and of Christ." And by the apostle John it is declared, "If that which ye have heard from the beginning shall remain in you, ye shall also continue in the Son, and in the Father." And again, "Truly our fellowship is with the Father, and with his Son Jesus Christ." Into that part and office in the mystery which the Father hath we have inquired diligently in several discourses, and we do now propose, by the help of the Spirit, to testify unto the office of the Son according as it is contained under his name Jesus

Christ the Lord. Into the mystery of his name Jesus we would then with all reverence first inquire.

The name Jesus being written at full length is Jehoshua, which consisteth of two parts—Hoshea, which was the original name of the son of Nun, and Jah, which was added by Moses when he sent him to spy out the land of Canaan. Hoshea is "saviour," or "salvation;" on which account it is said, "Thou shalt call his name Jesus, for he shall save his people from their sins." And Jah is a contraction of Jehovah, used singly to denote the whole force of that name in Ps. lxviii, 4, "Extol him that rideth upon the heavens by his name Jah;" used along with it to give it force and intensity in two passages of Isaiah. The first is: "Behold, God is my salvation (Hoshea); I will trust, and not be afraid: for the Lord (Jah) Jehovah is my strength and my song; he also is become my salvation (Hoshea)." This is a very remarkable passage, both as containing the two parts of the name Jesus, Jah and Hoshea, and as declaring that the Jewish people in the day of their restoration shall say that Jah Jehovah hath become Jah Hoshea, or Jesus their Saviour; and in consequence of this, their confession of the name of Christ, it is added, "Therefore with joy shall ye draw water out of the wells of salvation;" which I understand to signify their abundant and joyful partaking of the Holy Ghost. The other passage in which Jah occurs is to the same effect, and spoken of the same people against the same time—"We have a strong city: salvation (Hoshea) will God appoint for walls and bulwarks. . . . Trust ye in the Lord (Jehovah) forever: for in the Lord (Jah) is everlasting strength."

This separation of Jah, a part of the name Jehovah, from the rest, and this use of it in the separate form always in connection with the idea of salvation, and hence with the very

word Hoshea, I cannot but regard as a preparation for that combination and composition of the word into the one name Jehoshua, which in the type had been already done by an act of God's minister, and in the antitype was about to be done by the act of God himself. I observe further that Hoshea had his name changed when he went to spy out the land of Canaan, the inheritance which God had by the covenant of Sinai set apart unto the seed of Abraham.

The son of Nun had already, so to speak, won his name of "Saviour," by the various battles wherein God had given him to smite the enemies of Israel; but the name of Jehoshua he had to win for himself by going into the enemy's land and bringing out of it a faithful and good report, which was to signify that the Son of God, upon coming into this world which God hath intended for an inheritance of his saints, should have the name of Jesus given to him, and should earn the like, not by reporting it able to be taken, but by purchasing it to himself out of the hands of the enemy and acquiring the right to it for his people against the dispensation of the fullness of the times when the purchased possession shall be redeemed. These being the component parts of the name Jesus, let us now inquire into the meaning of each of them; for it is by understanding the name of the Son that we shall understand his person and his offices in the blessed Trinity.

The name Jah or Jehovah is sufficiently explained to us in that which the Lord spake unto Moses from the midst of the bush—"And God said unto Moses, I AM THAT I AM: and he said, Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, I AM, hath sent me unto you;" which teacheth us that self-existent, underived, unchangeable, self-sufficient being is that which is contained under the name Jehovah: self-existent in himself, underived from any higher origin, and unchangeable by any

cause; all-sufficient in himself, and therefore the origin, the changer, and the sufficiency of every other existing person and thing.

This incommunicable name the Jews held to be unutterably sacred, and would by no means name it, but retained it in the mysterious holiness of impenetrable silence; and whenever it occurred in the text they pronounced in its stead some of the appellations of God,—a fond conceit which degenerated at length into a base superstition, yet worthy to be mentioned as teaching us the opinion of the nation that in this name lay folded up, as it were, the very essence and substance of that Divine Being of whom all the other names expressed only the attributes.

There might also perhaps be concealed under this rabbinical conceit another act of worship done unto Moses and the Mosaic economy, with a view to which this name was assumed: as it is written in Exod. vi, 3—"I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob, by the name of God Almighty; but by my name Jehovah was I not known to them." This name Almighty, or Elohim, is proper to God as the maker of all the creatures, ere yet he had revealed himself as the chooser out and redeemer of a part of the fallen creatures, and was most proper to preserve men from running into the worship of the creature by continually declaring that it was made by another than itself; but when God began to manifest his purpose according to election by the calling out of Abraham and his salvation of a church from the wrecks of fallen nature by the imputation of a righteousness not inherent in it but derived from him, then he added to the name of God, the Creator of All, the special and peculiar propriety which he had in his chosen ones, saying, "I am the God of Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob," and appointing the same for a

memorial unto all generations; because this church portion, the saved portion of the fallen creatures, shall endure unto all ages and constitute God's most excellent and glorious inheritance.

But at the call of Moses, being about to institute a covenant wherein he was to pledge himself to ten thousand things, whereof not one was to be perfectly accomplished until after a hundred ages of sore contradiction and oppression, he thinketh it good to take unto himself a name which shall be expressive of constancy and faithfulness in the highest possible sense—a name which every one that knew it might trust; a name which should signify the same yesterday, to-day, and forever. And this name is Jehovah, of which Jah, the essence, hath been compounded into Jesus. By which component part, therefore, it is signified that the Jehovah of the covenant was no other than the Son, the same Divine Person who animated the child of the Virgin; and that all things which were spoken by Jehovah, Jesus undertaketh to fulfill.

That word Jah, incorporated with Hoshea in the name of our Blessed Lord, is to me a pledge that all things which are written in the law and the prophets the Son of Man hath come not to destroy but to fulfill. And accordingly we do find that Jesus hath applied to him the essential meaning of Jehovah, which is independence on all outward causes, and unalterable by time, as in Rev. xiii, 8—"Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, to-day, and forever." And again, quoting from Psalm cii—"Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth; and the heavens are the works of thine hands; they shall perish, but thou remainest; and they all shall wax old as doth a garment; and as a vesture shalt thou fold them up, and they shall be changed; but thou art the same, and thy years shall not fail." And, not to enu-

merate more instances, it is said of Christ what had just been said of the Father—"I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending, saith the Lord, which is, and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty"—an expression which some have thought to be no more than a translation into Greek of the Hebrew words Jehovah Elohim, or the Lord God.

Unto this much have we attained, therefore, that all the might and holiness, all the magnificence of power and splendor of operation, all the faithfulness and immovableness of purpose, together with all words whatsoever written of Jehovah and the old dispensation, are the property of him who hath revealed himself under the new as a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief, the meek, the humble, and the lowly Jesus.

The second part of this blessed name Jehoshua is Hoshea, which signifies salvation, and was added to the name Jah when the person of the Son united itself to the substance of the fallen creature for the end of redeeming and saving it; wherefore in this form of the God-man, while yet only conceived but not born, he is called Jesus, "for he shall save his people from their sins."

Though Jehovah had been known under the law as a great deliverer of his people from manifold oppressions, these deliverances had all been frustrated by their persevering disobedience, and they were now sold under the sorest bondage of all which they had ever proved, a bondage which endureth unto this day. He was known to them as yet, therefore, not as their saviour but as their judge, and the avenger of their wickedness. Nevertheless, in the mouth of all the prophets he had upon all occasions, and especially upon the eve of each new trial, assured them with the promise of a new and everlasting covenant, under which he would be merciful to their

unrighteousnesses, and would remember their iniquities no more, when the sin of Judah and of Israel should be sought for and should not be found; and when, together with all sin, all suffering and oppression should pass away.

To execute these promises and to bring in this dispensation of eternal salvation, the Virgin's Son had been promised both by Isaiah and Jeremiah; and now that the Virgin's Child is conceived he receiveth the name of Jah Hoshea, Jehovah the Saviour, to assure the faithful that he, and none but he, would accomplish all these things; and accordingly Zecharias, when his tongue was loosed, did prophesy of him in these words, "Blessed be the Lord God of Israel, for he hath visited and redeemed his people: and hath raised up an horn of salvation for us in the house of his servant David: as he spake by the mouth of all his holy prophets which have been since the world began."

To this deliverance not yet accomplished unto the Jewish people, to this salvation from their sins under the penalty of which they are still suffering, there can be no doubt that the name Jesus hath a primary reference, and that it was thus understood both by the Blessed Virgin and by the prophet Zecharias.

It would not have been proper to the Jewish economy, still in existence, to have spoken otherwise of Messiah than as he had been spoken of by all the prophets; and if he had been spoken of to them in the higher sense in which we are now to contemplate his salvation, it would have been to them unintelligible.

The sense I mean is that in which all believers look upon him as their Saviour in taking away their guilt and their judgment, and regenerating their natures, and raising them from the dead to the inheritance of eternal life and blessed-

ness. In this higher sense of the redeemer of the fallen creatures whom God hath chosen unto life eternal, the Jewish people were not privileged to perceive him otherwise than through the emblems of their state and nature, and by these emblems it shall yet be taught them against the day of their glory; but to us, taught by the Spirit, it is given to understand how Jehovah became the Saviour that instant he united himself to the seed of the woman. In taking a part of the fallen creature into union with himself and saving that part from the pollution of sin, the corruption of the grave, and the power of Satan, he gave assurance that God was with him, and in him wrought this same thing for his own glory; gave assurance that he was both purposed and able to redeem and restore with greater glory the fallen creature, to save it from sin and death, to bless it with holiness and eternal life.

When the Son of God took flesh, he entered upon the travail of salvation; when he carried that flesh triumphant to the right hand of God, he finished the work. By saving his own human nature, by preserving it from the taint of sin, by delivering it from the power of Satan, by carrying it into the region of glory, he did obtain eternal redemption for us, he did receive power to destroy him that had the power of death, and to deliver all them who through the fear of death were subject to bondage.

This power of saving others proceedeth from his saving of himself. He voluntarily brought himself into peril by taking to himself our nature; by being incarnate he became the champion of our salvation, by enduring the incarnation and overcoming all the creature's fallen condition, he accomplished our salvation; and from thenceforth he standeth alone the head of salvation, as he had been the head of creation,— not only Jehovah Elohim, the Lord God, but Jehovah

Hoshea, the Lord the Saviour. Now this voluntary peril which the Son of God undertook was for the greatest ends of the creature's glory and of the creature's well-being,—seeing God's glory as the Creator had been obscured, and the creature's goodly condition subverted by the fall; and therefore Jehovah is not fully manifested as the Saviour until all the effects of the fall shall have been clean wrought out of creation, and the handiwork of God shall stand sinless and glorious forever.

The name Jesus, therefore, carries us far beyond anything which we behold as yet accomplished, into the future everlasting condition of God's works, when everything that defileth and maketh a lie shall be purged off into the second death of the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone forever, and the heavens and earth which now are defiled and obscure shall with all their inhabitants, in the estate of infallible blessedness, acknowledge Jehovah their Creator to be also Jehovah their Saviour.

Save upon that human nature which he assumed, I may say that the virtue and power of the name Jesus hath not yet been exhibited. In this kind the whole work has been finished by the wonderful act of taking our nature, and going down with it into the region, first, of all temptation, and next of the grave or all corruption, and thence fetching it up and seating it in the place of all honor and all blessedness.

This exaltation which will yet be done upon all the chosen ones of God, and upon all that dependeth from them in their several degrees, hath as yet been only partially done upon any one of the saints, whose souls, though they be in glory, have left their bodies under the corruption of the grave—sad memorial of their sinfulness!

And we who being now in the body have the first fruits of

the Spirit, do nevertheless groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of the body: and all the creatures groan and travail together under bondage, waiting for that same glorious manifestation of the sons of God. And if so be that the name Jesus implies salvation from that curse and thraldom of sin under which the creation is now fallen, who will say that the name will be acquitted of its full blessedness until the bodies of the saints be brought up from their graves, and the world delivered from the headship of Satan and the power of death?

Now as his being born of the Virgin, and manifested as the seed of David, gave the beginning to the great work of our salvation, considered as shut up and represented in his human nature; and as the resurrection of his body from the dead gave the beginning to the work of conveying and communicating the same salvation to an elect few individuals in the gift of the Holy Ghost; even so his work of saving the Jewish nation from the hand of all their enemies will be the beginning of the work of delivering mankind from the dominion of Satan, and his being brought again into the world shall be the signal for delivering the bodies of his Church from the power of the grave. After which it only remaineth that by the judgment he should deliver all things created from the power of death; and then is the glorious name of Jesus, or Jah the Saviour, acquitted of its most precious burden.

Thus have I endeavored, dear brethren, to set forth unto you the meaning of the name Jesus, which the Godhead assumed in the act of taking unto itself the substance of the fallen creature, in order to save what of the fallen creatures it pleased him to save. And now I would, by the grace of God, endeavor to draw out from what hath been said certain conclusions of doctrine and practical inferences, which the

Lord may be pleased to bless unto your edification in knowledge, in faith, and in new obedience.

First, then, it is manifest from God's revealing himself as Jesus, or the Saviour, that the creatures are in a state of condemnation and of perdition; otherwise what meaning were there in revealing himself as their Saviour? As the name Elohim, or God the Almighty One, implies that every other one is not almighty, but of a limited power and subordinate place; and as the name Jehovah, or the Unchangeable One, implieth that all other beings are to undergo change and alteration according to his will; so doth the name Jesus, or Saviour, imply that all other beings whatsoever are in a state of condemnation and misery, from under which they need to be saved.

And whence cometh this state of misery and perdition is distinctly and directly revealed in the act of giving unto him the name,—"Thou shalt call his name Jesus, for he shall save his people from their sins." Be it known unto you, therefore, brethren, and of this be ye steadfastly assured, that our sins have divided between us and God, and brought us under the dominion of death and the grave, and the resurrection unto judgment, and the sentence of the second death, which nothing can avert, from which nothing can deliver and save us, but trust upon the name of Jesus, and believing in God as the only Saviour from our sins.

Put away, therefore, from amongst you all confidence which is elsewhere rested than upon the name of Jesus, and otherwise proceedeth than through faith in the incarnation, and obedience, and death, and burial of the Lord Jesus Christ. Be ye assured, that if God spared not his own Son when he had assumed our fallen nature, and become a partaker of flesh and blood with the rest of the brethren, that he will not spare

us who have no divine community of substance with the Father, who have no eternal generation by the Father, who have no inhabitation of the Father's bosom, and participation of his counsel, to interest the Father for our sakes; and if these being present in Jesus did not avert the sword of God from smiting the Shepherd, oh, how think you that we rebellious creatures can ever escape if we should neglect such great salvation!

If over him the law laid its line of righteousness, and its plumbline of judgment, exacting obedience unto every jot and tittle of its holy, just, and good commandments, shall it, oh, can it, be relaxed unto such as we are! If the holiness of God was not prevented from its action and infliction upon him who was the manifestation of his love, and grace, and glory, how shall it, how can it be silent, be inactive, be changed towards us, who are manifestations of rebellion, ingratitude, unfruitfulness, and sin!

Say then, believe then, know then, and be assured that in the way of God's holiness and justice, in the way of his law and our obedience thereto, there is nothing but condemnation and perdition forever and forever. Acknowledge this, and have no confidence in the flesh, or in the powers of the natural man.

Say, "I am indeed a sinner, and the chief of sinners; my righteousnesses are as filthy rags; in all things I come short of the glory of God; in my best estate I am but vanity. I have been feeding upon the east wind while I trusted in my own works; and I shall continue to feed on the east wind, be parched, be blighted, be shrivelled up like the tree of the wilderness over which the east wind bloweth, so long as I shall look for any righteousness or hope for any salvation through anything which I can do for myself, or which others

can do for me. I am a condemned man; I can ask no second trial; my mouth is shut, my doom is written, my fate is sealed." This, even this, no less, is what I require of you to believe, and to feel as the just conclusion from the name of Jesus, which the eternal revealer of God, even the Son, hath taken unto himself under the gospel dispensation.

And now, in the second place, I call upon you to believe and to feel, that unto a world thus sealed and set apart unto condemnation God hath revealed himself as a Saviour. As he did reveal himself its Creator, so now revealeth he himself its Saviour; and this message of reconciliation hath he committed unto me his minister to make known unto you all, that albeit ye are guilty before him, and have no plea in your mouth, he is of such wondrous grace, and hath for the creatures of his hand such pitiful love and tender compassion, being a sovereign withal whom no one can question, saying, "What doest thou?" that he hath given his only-begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him might not perish, but have everlasting life; that he is in Jesus Christ reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing unto men their trespasses.

Believe, then, though all have sinned and come short of the glory of God, you are justified "freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus; whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God; to declare, I say, at this time his righteousness, that he might be just, and the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus." As in my former conclusion of doctrine and practice I did entreat you to be separate from all creature trust, and to regard the whole creation of God as under the bondage of sin and death, lying in the wicked one;

so now do I entreat and invoke you to look unto Jesus, the author and the finisher of your faith.

Receive the grace of God by him preached, and from him proceeding forth. Receive the pardon of your guilt written in his blood and sealed with the key of David, which openeth and no man shutteth, which shutteth and no man openeth. As the prisoner no more doubteth when the reprieve of his sovereign cometh under the great seal of the kingdom by the hands of the king's proper messenger; so doubt ye no more, let the world doubt no more after it hath received the good news of salvation by the Son of God, to this very end appointed by his name Jesus, and for the assurance of this very thing constituted by his union, his inseparable and indivisible union with the nature of the creatures which had been imprisoned under the sentence of the law of the Jehovah King, the Unchangeable One.

Ah! is it not as if to some poor, doubting, disbelieving woman under sentence of death, the king's son, that he might give her fast assurance and chase away her despair, should wed himself to her, join himself as one, that her poor fainting heart might be reassured? So did Christ, in order to convince the children of mother Eve, who in their mother's transgression had transgressed, and in their mother's sentence had been doomed, come and wed himself, his eternal divinity, unto the seed of mother Eve, that the family, all the family, might truly know and feel assured that they had found grace in the sight of God, and were beloved because he is Love, and can love what in itself is all unlovely. And now I ask you to believe that you are saved in Christ; to rejoice and hold up your heads, because you are redeemed; to go on and rejoice, and prosper, and do exploits under that banner of salvation which he hath displayed because of the truth.

And now, finally, with respect to the manner of conveying this salvation which he wrought out by his obedience unto the death, we have to observe that it is not by giving out of himself unto another, but by bringing that other into himself that the communication of the blessedness proceedeth. To give unto us an existence out of himself is the work of creation. To bring the thing created into union, into oneness with himself, is the work of redemption, which therefore proceeded by joining unto himself, by taking up into hypostatical union with himself the nature of man.

And every one who is redeemed is in like manner taken up into union with his human nature, so as to be one with him as he is one with the Father. But this union of the redeemed ones unto Christ is not of the same kind as the union of his human nature unto his divine. The human nature of Christ is a part of his personal, and shall continue so forever; but not so is it with his saved ones, who are separate persons from Christ, though of the same substance with his human nature unto which they are consubstantiated by the Holy Ghost proceeding from him to this very end of bringing them into union with him, just as the seed of plants hath power to assimilate unto itself the elemental substances on which it feeds, and so to produce many seeds and many plants of the like kind.

Or to preserve our similitude still more correct, as the one stem of the vine hath power through the appropriation unto itself of elemental matters to put forth many branches, whereon grow the clusters of ripe fruit; so doth Christ the true vine of the Father's planting, of the Father's dressing, by operation of the Holy Spirit upon the creature, produce many separate persons in his own likeness, many branches growing out of and unto himself. In their union with him

standeth their fertility, and being separated from him they are good for nothing but to be cast out and trodden under the foot of men. The Holy Spirit, therefore, which proceedeth from Christ doth unite us unto Christ, and enable us to abide in him,—doth not unite us unto the Godhead of the Son, but doth unite us to the manhood of Christ.

And the completeness of the saved ones will be accomplished at his coming; after which, if I err not, the manner of this salvation will somewhat change. For I reckon there is a dignity and a closeness in the union between Christ and his elect or bridal Church which now is suffering with him and for him, that there is not between him and the numerous hosts which shall come and be joined unto him in the age to come, of which he is declared to be the father; whereas of the Church that now is, he is the husband.

But still as the children are of the same substance with their parents, so shall the innumerable company of the saints in the age to come be taken out of the stock of an evil nature subject unto death, and brought into the stock of a redeemed nature which hath triumphed over death; and so all the saved ones are saved by being taken out of the sinful mass and consubstantiated with that atom, so to speak, of redeemed substance which the Son joined unto himself, and which the Father gave to have life in itself.

And as Christ the great quickener, the eternal life manifested, doth thus draw unto himself those whom the Father giveth him out of that separateness and wickedness in which they are by nature, and so doth save them in himself, not out of himself; even in like manner do these same saved ones draw up along with them this world which was made for man, with its sun, and moon, and stars, and fish and flying fowl, and living creatures, to the utter exclusion of death and ex-

tinction of sin and misery; and then the work of creation will appear to have been but the rudiments of and preparation for the work of redemption by the manifestation of Jehovah under the name of Jesus.

And now, brethren, before I close, allow me to express, in a few words, the heartfelt satisfaction with which I return to my charge over your souls, and to the labors of the ministry in this city. The tidings which I received from time to time of your love and fellowship in the Lord, of your constancy in the duties of public worship, did afford me great consolation in my absence; and a good report concerning you is, I may say, spread abroad amongst the churches. In which let us rejoice together. Let us remark with gratitude the hand of God in sending amongst us ministers of good and honorable report, in whose mouth the substance of the doctrine which I teach hath been confirmed.

And now let us proceed with renewed confidence in the great Head of the Church, to hold up in this city a banner for the truth. Let us go on unto perfection, and not stop until we reach the stature of a perfect man in Christ. You may desire naturally to know what reception the word which I preached met with in our native land and in our mother Church. Everywhere, I may truly say, the people heard me gladly, and from the ministers of the gospel I received much brotherly kindness; for all which I return thanks this day to the great Head of the Church.

I preached unto them the coming of the Lord in judgment, little thinking that I should witness any act of his judgment; but so it was, the Lord did lift up his hand and make a breach in the midst of the congregation. It is a fearful thing, let me tell you, brethren, to witness such an awful sight; but oh, if those days of judgment and of visitation be so near at

hand, what sights more awful await our eyes! If those days be at hand concerning which it is said, that unless they were shortened no flesh should be saved, oh, then, what death, what destruction, what ruin, may we not be prepared to see! Enter, oh enter, then, into your chambers, ye people of the Lord, and shut your doors and hide yourselves as it were for a little moment until the indignation be overpast.

Have I not preached unto you this day the name of Jesus, that rock of refuge and high tower of salvation? Flee unto him speedily, speedily, who hath been the dwelling-place of his people in all generations. Everything shall change but Jehovah, everything shall perish which is not united unto Jehovah the Saviour. There is no other name given under heaven whereby men must be saved but the name of Jesus; and every one who knoweth his name will put his trust in him. Trust ye in the Lord forever, for in the Lord Jehovah is everlasting strength. Amen and amen.

RUSSELL

LORD JOHN RUSSELL, first Earl Russell, a noted English statesman, the third son of the sixth Duke of Bedford, was born in London, August 18, 1792. He was educated at Westminster School and the University of Edinburgh, and, entering Parliament as member for Tavistock when but twenty-one, immediately began to manifest an active opposition to Tory principles and an equally spirited advocacy of Roman Catholic emancipation and parliamentary reform. While greatly absorbed in politics he also gave much attention to literature, publishing a "Life of William, Lord Russell," 1819; "Essay on the History of the English Government and Constitution," 1821; two tragedies, "The Nun of Arrouca" and "Don Carlos," 1822; "Memoirs of the Affairs of Europe," 1824; and a translation of the fifth book of "The Odyssey," 1827. In 1828 Russell led the movement which resulted in the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts, achieved Roman Catholic emancipation the next year, and in 1832 acquired the widest popularity by his success with the Reform Bill. From 1835 to 1839 he was home secretary, for two years more colonial secretary, and for many years after 1841 continued to represent London in the House of Commons. He was premier, 1846–52, a post which he filled again for a year after the death of Lord Palmerston in 1865. In the meantime he had become Earl Russell in 1861, and entering the House of Lords took a prominent part in its debates. In his later years he published a "Life of Fox," 1866; "Rise and Progress of the Christian Religion in the West of Europe," 1873; "Recollections and Suggestions, 1815–1873," 1875; "Selections From His Speeches, 1817–41," appeared in 1870. His death took place at Richmond Park, Surrey, May 28, 1878. Lord Russell was not a great orator, but his speeches always had the merit of deeply impressing thoughtful hearers. Throughout his long and honorable career he ardently supported every measure that he believed would promote the general good and every movement in the direction of freedom. It is of interest to remember that to Lord Russell is due the appointment of Tennyson as poet laureate.

ON THE BALLOT

DELIVERED IN THE HOUSE OF LORDS, JULY 8, 1872

I THINK I may venture to address your lordships on the present occasion, as my attention has been directed to the subject of the ballot for more than forty years. When, in 1831, the ministry of the late Earl Grey was formed on the principle of introducing the question of parliamentary

reform as a ministerial question, I was one of a committee of the ministers to whom was committed the charge of drawing up the scheme of the first reform bill. The proposals of that committee contained a recommendation of the ballot.

When Earl Grey spoke to me of the scheme he said that while the cabinet cordially approved of the measure as a whole, there was one part of it to which they could by no means assent—namely, the ballot. He asked me whether I attached much importance to the point, and whether I was willing to give it up. My answer was that in fact I had used every argument to induce the committee not to insert the ballot in their proposals. The suggestion of the ballot was consequently omitted from the reform bill which I introduced into the House of Commons, and it never appeared in any of the subsequent bills. Since that time I have watched all the discussions that have been raised upon the ballot question, and have taken part in some, and have seen no ground for changing the opinions I entertained forty years ago.

The late Sir Robert Peel was as much opposed to the ballot as Earl Grey. Many noble lords will remember the speech of wonderful argumentative force and eloquence which he delivered against Mr. Grote's motion in 1838. The result of the debate on that occasion was that the motion of Mr. Grote was rejected by a majority of 117. The present prime minister [Mr. Gladstone] has eight or nine times voted against the ballot in the House of Commons.

It was therefore with no little surprise that I heard the year before last that Mr. Gladstone had suddenly announced that he had become a convert to it. The reason given for this sudden conversion was twofold—first, that secret voting had been adopted all over the world; and, secondly, that now every adult person in England had the right of voting.

These two reasons are no doubt plausible; but the allegations on which they rest are totally inadequate. With regard to the first, it is far from being true that the ballot has been introduced all over the world. It has not been adopted even in all our own colonies. The good sense of the people of the Dominion has refused to accept its introduction in Canada, and if I do not mistake, the use of secret voting has not been practically adopted in our great colony of Victoria. Secret ballot does not really exist in half of the States of the American Union. In the New England State of Massachusetts a law was passed by which a voter might go to a public office and ask for an envelope in which he might enclose his vote, and thus, if he chose, keep the way in which he voted a secret. That was, if anything, an "optional ballot"—the secrecy was in the absolute power of the voter himself.

At the end of three or four years some curious people wished to know how many of those envelopes had been taken, and whether any great number of the electors had chosen to vote secretly. It was found that very few, if any, of the electors had taken those envelopes or chosen to vote secretly. The law was therefore repealed, and everyone voted openly. No doubt, open voting gives opportunity for intimidation; but, in my opinion, the system embodied in the present measure will increase personation, will increase bribery, will increase fraud and falsehood of every kind—indeed, in whatever light secret voting is viewed, it seems a bad system; it is nothing but an increased power of corruption in every direction.

It will encourage falsehood, for it is quite possible under the ballot that a voter may be intimidated by his landlord into promising his vote; but having the power to vote will secretly vote against his promise. He would then go to his

landlord and say, "I voted as you asked me; I quite agree in your opinions, and have voted with you." It was some such argument as this that Mr. Grote put forward in proof of the value of the ballot in checking the influence of the landlord and employer, and he maintained that the tenant would be perfectly justified in acting in this way.

It seems, however, to me that though the intimidation may fail as to the actual vote, the ballot will introduce a new form of fraud and distrust which will not be much preferable to the old-fashioned intimidation. The Englishman's privilege of public voting should be as sacredly respected; he should have the same right of voting openly as he has by the existing law; and at least there is no reason why the electors of Old England should be deprived of a privilege of open voting which is enjoyed by the voters of New England.

It seems to me a great argument in support of open voting that a man who is desirous of promoting some great public question; of something that would improve the condition of his fellow creatures—is more likely than any other man to give his vote publicly, and will be proud of proclaiming his support of a candidate who holds large and liberal views.

When Sir Samuel Romilly was engaged in his endeavors to mitigate the severity of our criminal code, and was a candidate for Westminster, an elector, sympathizing with his efforts, was proud to say, "I vote for Samuel Romilly!" Why should not a voter be allowed to proclaim his sympathy with a man whose life is devoted to mitigating the sufferings of his fellow men? Or again, when Wilberforce stood before the great constituency of Yorkshire, the champion of the abolition of slavery throughout the world—a great and noble aspiration—surely the electors should not be prohibited from

proclaiming openly, in the face of all men, "I vote for Mr. Wilberforce and the emancipation of the human race!"

This bill will make the revelation of his vote an offence and a crime on the part of the official persons who are in the polling booth at the time. It is provided by this bill that the voter, having secretly marked his vote on the ballot paper and folded it up so as to conceal his vote, shall place it in a closed box. There is, indeed, no penalty imposed on the voter for telling his vote, but every officer, clerk, and agent in attendance at a polling station who shall communicate at any time to any person any information obtained in a polling station, as to the candidate for whom any voter in such station is about to vote, or has voted, will be liable, on summary conviction before two justices of the peace, to imprisonment for any term not exceeding six months, with or without hard labor.

I feel ashamed that such a proposition should have come up from the other House. Surely it is a degradation to which the country will never submit. As to the allegation that every adult man in England has the right of voting, it is allowed by Mr. Gladstone himself not to be an accurate statement, and he rebukes Mr. Disraeli for supposing that every man who marries has the right of voting. I must, in addition, point out that our whole progress for the last century and a half has been in favor of publicity. There was a time when the proceedings of Parliament were published under the disguise of "Debates in the Senate of Lilliput," and notes of the speeches were prefixed by fictitious names.

I remember, in my own time, seeing the sergeant-at-arms bring before the House a man whom he found making notes in the gallery. Since that time we have gone on introducing

more and more publicity in the transaction of public affairs. The debates in Parliament are reported day by day, under the real names of the speakers, and are openly discussed the next morning in the journals throughout the kingdom. The proceedings of the courts of law are public, and the man who is called upon to give evidence in a court of law is not allowed the shelter of secrecy even where—as is too often the case in Ireland—his giving evidence may be attended with risk to his life. No exemptions are made, all questions affecting life and property are decided in public. Yet it is now proposed that if a man comes to the polling booth, and says, "I wish to vote for Lord Enfield," so essential is secrecy in the performance of public duty that the open declaration of a man's wish and opinion by an officer in the polling booth is declared to be a disgrace and a crime.

We declare that publicity must be the rule of our law courts whatever the consequences. In one of our courts, presided over by a member of this House, cases arise of which the publicity is injurious to morality and offensive to decency, nevertheless no exception is made. Proposals have been made that in the divorce court proceedings may be taken in secrecy if the judge shall think fit; but no—the noble and learned lord who presides over that court approves of publicity; and by means of this publicity all persons may read the details of these trials in the public journals.

At whatever cost, the law must be administered in public; but when you come to the election of the lawgivers—secrecy is so essential in the performance of this form of public duty—the vote must be so entirely in the bosom of the voter that it is impossible that publicity can be allowed—the vote must be given in secret. The man who is in office in the booth and hears a person say, "I vote for Lord Enfield," or, "I vote

for Lord George Hamilton," is liable to six months' imprisonment.

This is simply monstrous. The people of England have for hundreds of years been free to go to the poll and say, "I vote for such and such a man because I look upon him as the most fit." But this is no longer to be allowed—secrecy, not freedom of voting, is henceforth to be the rule.

I will not go into the question of the ulterior results of secret voting, but I do not believe it will long stand alone. Probably it will lead in no very long time to universal suffrage. I cannot forbear from noting the language of the administration of Earl Grey in reference to the great plans for parliamentary reform which they had laid before Parliament. In 1831 there appeared the following passage in the speech from the throne:

"I have availed myself of the earliest opportunity of resorting to your advice and assistance after the dissolution of the late Parliament. Having had recourse to that measure for the purpose of ascertaining the sense of my people on the expediency of a reform in the representation, I have now to recommend that important question to your earliest and most attentive consideration, confident that in any measures which you may prepare for its adjustment you will carefully adhere to the acknowledged principles of the constitution, by which the prerogative of the crown, the authority of both Houses of Parliament, and the rights and liberties of the people are equally secured."

That was firm and clear language. No such language is heard in these days. On the contrary, when a question arises affecting the hereditary rights of your lordships, the prime minister says, "I will think once, twice, or thrice before touching such a question." That, however, was not the course adopted by the people of England upon a recent oc-

casion. When the people of England found that the life of the heir to the throne was in peril, they did not think thrice, or twice, or even once; but by one unanimous voice, as if impelled by instinct, in supplication for the heir to the throne, they put up prayers to heaven for his recovery. It is not by measures of this kind, but by feelings such as those which animated the whole people during that crisis—and which, I trust, will ever be the sentiments of the people of England—that the constitution can be preserved, and the rights and liberties of the people secured.

HOUSTON

SAMUEL HOUSTON, a noted American general and politician, was born near Lexington, Virginia, March 2, 1793. His education was scanty and his youth was largely spent among the Cherokee Indians. At twenty he entered the army and served under Jackson in the campaign against the Creek Indians, but leaving the service in 1818, he began the study of law at Nashville, and rose to be successively district attorney, adjutant-general and major-general. He represented Tennessee in Congress, 1823-27, and was governor of that State for the two years following. Resigning in 1829 he went to live in Arkansas with his early friends, the Cherokees, whose interests he afterwards represented as agent in Washington. In 1832 he settled in Texas and when that region was denied entrance as a State into the Mexican republic and war ensued between Texas and Mexico, Houston was appointed commander-in-chief of the Texan forces. At San Jacinto, in 1836, Houston defeated and captured the Mexican general, Santa Anna, thereby securing the independence of Texas. From that period until its annexation to the United States, Houston was president of the Texan Republic, and for the twelve years following its admission to the Union represented it in the United States Senate. In 1859 he was elected governor of Texas, but on account of opposition to secession resigned this office and retired to private life, dying at Huntsville, Texas, July 25, 1863.

SPEECH ON THE NEBRASKA AND KANSAS BILL

DELIVERED IN THE UNITED STATES SENATE, MARCH 3, 1857

MR. PRESIDENT,—I have very little hope that any appeal which I can make for the Indians will do any good. The honorable senator from Indiana [Mr. Pettit] says in substance that God Almighty has condemned them and has made them an inferior race; that there is no use in doing anything for them. With great deference to that senator, for whom I have never cherished any but kindly feelings, I must be permitted to dissent from his opinions. He says they are not civilized and they are not homogeneous, and cannot be so. with the white race. They

cannot be civilized! No! Sir, it is idle to tell me that. We have Indians on our western borders whose civilization is not inferior to our own.

It is within the recollection of gentlemen here that, more than twenty years ago, President Ross, one of them, held a correspondence upon the rights of the Indians to the Cherokee country which they possessed east of the Mississippi, and maintained himself in the controversy with great credit and ability; and the triumph of Mr. Adams, if it was one, was much less than he had obtained over the diplomatist of Spain [Mr. Don Onis] in relation to the occupation of Florida by General Jackson. The senator from Indiana says that in ancient times Moses received a command to go and drive the Canaanites and Moabites out of the land of Canaan, and that Joshua subsequently made the experiment of incorporating one tribe of the heathen with the Israelites, but it finally had to be killed off. Therefore, the senator concludes, the Cherokees cannot be civilized. There may have been something statesmanlike in the policy, but I do not discover the morality of it. I will say, however, that there is no analogy between the two cases. The people of Judea who were killed or exterminated were idolaters, and the object was to keep the people of Israel free from the taint of idols and idolatry under the command of Providence, and therefore the extermination in his dispensation became necessary. But the Cherokees never have been idolaters, neither have the Creeks, nor the Choctaws, nor the Chickasaws. They believe in one Great Spirit—in God—the white man's God. They believe in his Son Jesus Christ, and his atonement and propitiation for the sins of men. They believe in the sanctifying efficacy of the Holy Ghost. They bow at the Christian's altar and they believe the Sacred Volume.

Sir, you may drive these people away and give their lands to the white man; but let it not be done upon the justification of the Scriptures. They have well-organized societies; they have villages and towns; they have their State-houses and their capitols; they have females and men who would grace the drawing-rooms or salons of Washington; they have a well-organized judiciary, a trial by jury, and the writ of habeas corpus.

These are the people for whom I demand justice in the organization of these Territories. They are men of education. They have more than one hundred native preachers in those tribes, as I have heard. They have their colleges, as I remarked in my former address to the Senate on this subject. They become associated in friendship with our young men in the various institutions in the United States; and they are prepared to be incorporated upon equal terms with us. But even if they were wild Indians, untutored, when you deprive them of what would give them knowledge and discourage them from making an effort to become civilized and social beings, how can you expect them to be otherwise than savage?

When you undertake to tame wild horses do you turn them from you and drive them into the desert, or do you take care of them and treat them with humanity? These Indians are not inferior, intellectually, to white men. John Ridge was not inferior in point of genius to John Randolph. His father, in point of native intellect, was not inferior to any man. Look at their social condition in the nations to which I have alluded. Look at the Chickasaws who remain in the State of Mississippi. Even among white men, with all their prejudices against the Indians, with their transcendent genius and accomplishments, they have been elected to the legislature. Whenever they

have had an opportunity they have shown that they are not inferior to white men, either in sense or sensibility.

But the honorable senator from Iowa [Mr. Dodge] characterizes the remarks which I made in reference to the Indians as arising from a feeling of "sickly sentimentality." Sir, it is a sickly sentimentality that was implanted in me when I was young, and it has grown up with me. The Indian has a sense of justice, truth, and honor that should find a responsive chord in every heart. If the Indians on the frontier are barbarous, or if they are cannibals, and eat each other, who are to blame for it? They are robbed of the means of sustenance; and with hundreds and thousands of them starving on the frontier, hunger may prompt to such acts to prevent their perishing. We shall never become cannibals in connection with the Indians; but we do worse than that. We rob them, first of their native dignity and character; we rob them next of what the government appropriates for them. If we do not do it in this hall, men are invested with power and authority, who, officiating as agents or traders, rob them of everything which is designed for them. Not less than one hundred millions of dollars, I learn from statistics, since the adoption of this government, have been appropriated by Congress for purposes of justice and benevolence toward the Indians; but I am satisfied that they have never realized fifteen millions beneficially. They are too remote from the seat of government for their real condition to be understood here; and if the government intends liberality or justice toward them it is often diverted from the intended object and consumed by speculators.

I am a friend to the Indian upon the principle that I am a friend to justice. We are not bound to make them promises; but if a promise be made to an Indian it ought to be regarded

as sacredly as if it were made to a white man. If we treat them as tribes, recognize them, send commissioners to form treaties and exchange ratifications with them, and the treaties are negotiated, accepted, ratified, and exchanged—having met with the approval of the Senate—I think they may be called compacts; and how are these compacts regarded? Just as we choose to construe them at the time, without any reference to the wishes of the Indians or whether we do them kindness or justice in the operation or not. We are often prompted to their ratification by persons interested; and we lend ourselves unintentionally to an unjust act of oppression upon the Indians by men who go and get their signatures to a treaty. The Indian's mark is made; the employees of the government certify or witness it; and the Indians do not understand it for they do not know what is written. These are some of the circumstances connected with the Indians.

Gentlemen have spoken here of voting millions to build ships, and placing the army and navy at the disposition of the President in the event that England act inconsistently with treaty stipulations. This is done because, if England violates a treaty with us, our national honor is injured. Now I should like to know if it becomes us to violate a treaty made with the Indians when we please, regardless of every principle of truth and honor? We should be careful if it were with a power able to war with us; and it argues a degree of infinite meanness and indescribable degradation on our part to act differently with the Indians, who confide in our honor and justice, and who call the President their Great Father and confide in him. Mr. President, it is in the power of the Congress of the United States to do some justice to the Indians by giving them a government of their own, and encouraging them in their organization and improvement by inviting their delegates to a

place on the floor of the Senate and House of Representatives. If you will not do it, the sin will lie at your door, and Providence, in his own way, mysterious and incomprehensible to us though it is, will accomplish all his purposes, and may at some day avenge the wrongs of the Indians upon our nation. As a people we can save them; and the sooner the great work is begun, the sooner will humanity have cause to rejoice in its accomplishment.

Mr. President, I shall say but little more. My address may have been desultory. It embraces many subjects which it would be very hard to keep in entire order. We have, in the first place, the extensive territory; then we have the considerations due to the Indians; and then we have the proposed repeal of the Missouri Compromise, which seems to require the most explanation and to be the main point in the controversy. The great principle involved in that repeal is non-intervention, which, we are told, is to be of no practical benefit if the Compromise is repealed. It can have no effect but to keep up agitation. Sir, the friends who have survived the distinguished men who took prominent parts in the drama of the Compromise of 1850 ought to feel gratified that those men are not capable of participating in the events of to-day, but that they were permitted, after they had accomplished their labors and seen their country in peace, to leave the world, as Simeon did, with the exclamation: "Lord, now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace, for mine eyes have seen thy salvation." They departed in peace, and they left their country in peace. They felt, as they were about to be gathered to the tombs of their fathers, that the country they had loved so well and which had honored them—that country upon whose fame and name their doings had shed a bright lustre which shines abroad throughout all Christendom—was reposing in peace and happiness.

What would their emotions be if they could now be present and see an effort made, if not so designed, to undo all their work and to tear asunder the cords that they had bound around the hearts of their countrymen? They have departed. The nation felt the wound; and we see the memorials of woe still in this chamber. The proud symbol (the eagle) above your head remains enshrouded in black, as if it deplored the misfortune which had fallen upon us, or as a fearful omen of future calamities which await our nation in the event this bill should become a law.

Above it I behold the majestic figure of Washington, whose presence must ever inspire patriotic emotions and command the admiration and love of every American heart. By these associations I adjure you to regard the contract once made to harmonize and preserve this Union. Maintain the Missouri Compromise! Stir not up agitation. Give us peace.

This much I was bound to declare, in behalf of my country, as I believe, and I know in behalf of my constituents. In the discharge of my duty I have acted fearlessly. The events of the future are left in the hands of a wise Providence; and, in my opinion, upon the decision which we make upon this question must depend union or disunion.

EVERETT

EDWARD EVERETT was born in Dorchester near Boston in 1794. He took a degree of Bachelor of Arts at Harvard College at the age of seventeen. His earlier predilection was for the law, but the advice of Joseph Buckminster, a distinguished preacher in Boston, led young Everett to prepare for the pulpit, and in this vocation he at once distinguished himself. Before he was twenty years old, he was called to the ministry of one of the largest Boston churches. In 1814, after a service of little more than a year in the pulpit, he resigned his charge to become a Professor of Greek Literature in Harvard College. After nearly five years spent in Europe in preparation for that post, he entered upon its duties, and for five years more gave a vigorous impulse not only to the study of Greek, but to all the work of the college. About the same time he assumed charge of the "North American Review." In 1824 he was chosen a member of Congress and for ten years held a seat in the House of Representatives. In 1835 he was chosen Governor of Massachusetts, and filled the office for four years. In 1841 he was appointed United States Minister to England. In 1846 he became President of Harvard College, and filled that office for three years. In 1852, on the death of Daniel Webster, he was made by President Fillmore Secretary of State, and when he left that post, he was sent from Massachusetts to the United States Senate. During the last years of his life he delivered an oration on Washington throughout the country, and thus contributed more than a hundred thousand dollars for the purchase of Washington's old home at Mount Vernon. In 1860 he was nominated for the Vice-Presidency on the Whig ticket. The last of his great orations was pronounced at Gettysburg, after the battle, on the consecration of the national cemetery in that place. He died on January 15, 1865.

THE HISTORY OF LIBERTY

DELIVERED AT CHARLESTOWN, MASSACHUSETTS, JULY 4, 1828

THE event which we commemorate is all-important, not merely in our own annals, but in those of the world. The sententious English poet has declared that "the proper study of mankind is man," and of all inquiries of a temporal nature, the history of our fellow-beings is unquestionably among the most interesting. But not all the

chapters of human history are alike important. The annals of our race have been filled up with incidents which concern not, or at least ought not to concern, the great company of mankind. History, as it has often been written, is the genealogy of princes, the field-book of conquerors; and the fortunes of our fellow-men have been treated only so far as they have been affected by the influence of the great masters and destroyers of our race. Such history is, I will not say a worthless study, for it is necessary for us to know the dark side as well as the bright side of our condition. But it is a melancholy study which fills the bosom of the philanthropist and the friend of liberty with sorrow.

But the history of Liberty—the history of men struggling to be free—the history of men who have acquired and are exercising their freedom—the history of those great movements in the world, by which liberty has been established and perpetuated, forms a subject which we cannot contemplate too closely. This is the real history of man, of the human family, of rational immortal beings.

This theme is one: the free of all climes and nations are themselves a people. Their annals are the history of freedom. Those who fell victims to their principles in the civil convulsions of the short-lived republics of Greece, or who sunk beneath the power of her invading foes; those who shed their blood for liberty amid the ruins of the Roman Republic; the victims of Austrian tyranny in Switzerland and of Spanish tyranny in the Netherlands; the solitary champions or the united bands of high-minded and patriotic men who have, in any region or age, struggled and suffered in this great cause, belong to that people of the free whose fortunes and progress are the most noble theme man can contemplate.

The theme belongs to us. We inhabit a country which has been signalized in the great history of freedom. We live under forms of government more favorable to its diffusion than any the world has elsewhere known. A succession of incidents, of rare curiosity, and almost mysterious connection, has marked out America as a great theatre of political reform. Many circumstances stand recorded in our annals, connected with the assertion of human rights, which, were we not familiar with them, would fill even our own minds with amazement.

The theme belongs to the day. We celebrate the return of the day on which our separate national existence was declared—the day when the momentous experiment was commenced, by which the world, and posterity, and we ourselves were to be taught how far a nation of men can be trusted with self-government—how far life, liberty, and property are safe, and the progress of social improvement is secure, under the influence of laws made by those who are to obey them—the day when, for the first time in the world, a numerous people was ushered into the family of nations, organized on the principle of the political equality of all the citizens.

Let us then, fellow-citizens, devote the time which has been set apart for this portion of the duties of the day, to a hasty review of the history of Liberty, especially to a contemplation of some of those astonishing incidents which preceded, accompanied, or have followed the settlement of America, and the establishment of our Constitutions, and which plainly indicate a general tendency and co-operation of things toward the erection, in this country, of the great monitorial school of political freedom.

We hear much at school of the liberty of Greece and

Rome—a great and complicated subject, which this is not the occasion to attempt to disentangle. True it is that we find, in the annals of both these nations, bright examples of public virtue—the record of faithful friends of their country—of strenuous foes of oppression at home or abroad —and admirable precedents of popular strength. But we nowhere find in them the account of a populous and extensive region, blessed with institutions securing the enjoyment and transmission of regulated liberty. In freedom, as in most other things, the ancient nations, while they made surprisingly close approaches to the truth, yet, for want of some one great and essential principle or instrument, they came utterly short of it in practice. They had profound and elegant scholars; but, for want of the art of printing, they could not send information out among the people, where alone it is of great use in reference to human happiness. Some of them ventured boldly out to sea, and possessed an aptitude for foreign commerce; yet, for want of the mariner's compass, they could not navigate distant seas, but crept for ages along the shores of the Mediterranean. In respect to freedom, they established popular governments in single cities; but, for want of the representative principle, they could not extend these institutions over a large and populous country. But as a large and populous country, generally speaking, can alone possess strength enough for self-defence, this want was fatal. The freest of their cities accordingly fell a prey, sooner or later, either to a foreign invader or to domestic traitors.

In this way, liberty made no firm progress in the ancient States. It was a speculation of the philosopher, and an experiment of the patriot, but not an established state of society. The patriots of Greece and Rome had indeed suc-

ceeded in enlightening the public mind on one of the cardinal points of freedom—the necessity of an elected executive. The name and the office of a king were long esteemed not only something to be rejected, but something rude and uncivilized, belonging to savage nations, ignorant of the rights of man, as understood in cultivated States. The word "tyrant," which originally meant no more than monarch, soon became with the Greeks synonymous with oppressor and despot, as it has continued to be ever since. When the first Cæsar made his encroachments on the liberties of Rome, the patriots even of that age boasted that they had—

> "heard their fathers say,
> There was a Brutus once, that would have brooked
> The eternal devil, to keep his state in Rome,
> As easily as a king."

So deeply rooted was this horror of the very name of king in the bosom of the Romans, that under their worst tyrants, and in the darkest days, the forms of the Republic were preserved. There was no name under Nero and Caligula for the office of monarch. The individual who filled the office was called Cæsar and Augustus, after the first and second of the line. The word "emperor" (imperator) implied no more than general. The offices of consul and tribune were kept up; although, if the choice did not fall, as it frequently did, on the emperor, it was conferred on his favorite general, and sometimes on his favorite horse. The Senate continued to meet, and affected to deliberate; and, in short, the Empire began and continued a pure military despotism, ingrafted, by a sort of permanent usurpation, on the forms and names of the ancient Republic. The spirit, indeed, of liberty had long since ceased to animate

these ancient forms, and when the barbarous tribes of Central Asia and Northern Europe burst into the Roman Empire, they swept away the poor remnant of these forms, and established upon their ruins the system of feudal monarchy from which all modern kingdoms are descended. Efforts were made in the Middle Ages by the petty republics of Italy to regain the political rights which a long proscription had wrested from them. But the remedy of bloody civil wars between neighboring cities was plainly more disastrous than the disease of subjection. The struggles of freedom in these little States resulted much as they had done in Greece, exhibiting brilliant examples of individual character, and short intervals of public prosperity, but no permanent progress in the organization of liberal governments.

At length a new era seemed to begin. The art of printing was invented. The capture of Constantinople by the Turks drove the learned Greeks of that city into Italy, and letters revived. A general agitation of public sentiment in various parts of Europe ended in the religious Reformation. A spirit of adventure had been awakened in the maritime nations, projects of remote discovery were started, and the signs of the times seemed to augur a great political regeneration. But, as if to blast this hope in its bud; as if to counterbalance at once the operation of these springs of improvement; as if to secure the permanence of the arbitrary institutions which existed in every part of the Continent, at the moment when it was most threatened, the last blow at the same time was given to the remaining power of the great barons, the sole check on the despotism of the monarch which the feudal system provided was removed, and a new institution was firmly established in Europe,

prompt, efficient, and terrible in its operation beyond anything which the modern world had seen—I mean the system of standing armies; in other words, a military force organized and paid to support the king on his throne and retain the people in their subjection.

From this moment, the fate of freedom in Europe was sealed. Something might be hoped from the amelioration of manners in softening down the more barbarous parts of political despotism, but nothing was to be expected in the form of liberal institutions, founded on principle.

The ancient and the modern forms of political servitude were thus combined. The Roman emperors, as I have hinted, maintained themselves simply by military force, in nominal accordance with the forms of the Republic. Their power (to speak in modern terms) was no part of the Constitution. The feudal sovereigns possessed a constitutional precedence in the State, which, after the diffusion of Christianity, they claimed by the grace of God; but their power, in point of fact, was circumscribed by that of their brother barons. With the firm establishment of standing armies was consummated a system of avowed despotism, paralyzing all expression of the popular will, existing by divine right, and unbalanced by any effectual check in the State. It needs but a glance at the state of Europe, in the beginning of the sixteenth century, to see, that, notwithstanding the revival and diffusion of letters, the progress of the Reformation, and the improvement of the manners, the tone of the people, in the most enlightened countries, was more abject than it had been since the days of the Cæsars. The state of England certainly compared favorably with that of any other part of Europe; but who can patiently listen to the language with which Henry VIII. chides, and Eliza-

beth scolds the Lords and Commons of the Parliament of Great Britain?

All hope of liberty then seemed lost; in Europe all hope was lost. A disastrous turn had been given to the general movement of things; and in the disclosure of the fatal secret of standing armies, the future political servitude of man was apparently decided.

But a change is destined to come over the face of things, as romantic in its origin as it is wonderful in its progress. All is not lost; on the contrary, all is saved, at the moment when all seemed involved in ruin. Let me just allude to the incidents connected with this change, as they have lately been described by an accomplished countryman, now beyond the sea.

About half a league from the little seaport of Palos, in the province of Andalusia, in Spain, stands a convent dedicated to St. Mary. Some time in the year 1486, a poor, wayfaring stranger, accompanied by a small boy, makes his appearance on foot at the gate of this convent, and begs of the porter a little bread and water for his child. This friendless stranger is Columbus. Brought up in the hardy pursuit of a mariner—occasionally serving in the fleets of his native country—with the burden of fifty years upon his frame, the unprotected foreigner makes his suit to the sovereigns of Portugal and Spain. He tells them that the broad, flat earth on which we tread is round, and he proposes, with what seems a sacrilegious hand, to lift the veil which has hung from the creation of the world over the bounds of the ocean. He promises, by a western course, to reach the eastern shores of Asia, the region of gold, diamonds, and spices; to extend the sovereignty of Christian kings over realms and nations hitherto unap-

proached and unknown; and, ultimately, to perform a new crusade to the Holy Land, and ransom the sepulchre of our Saviour with the new-found gold of the East.

Who shall believe the chimerical pretension? The learned men examine it and pronounce it futile. The royal pilots have ascertained by their own experience that it is groundless. The priesthood have considered it, and have pronounced the sentence, so terrific where the Inquisition reigns, that it is a wicked heresy. The common-sense and popular feeling of men have been kindled into disdain and indignation toward a project, which, by a strange, new chimera, represented one-half of mankind walking with their feet toward the other half.

Such is the reception which his proposal meets. For a long time, the great cause of humanity, depending on the discovery of this fair continent, is involved in the fortitude, perseverance, and spirit of the solitary stranger, already past the time of life when the pulse of adventure beats full and high. If, sinking beneath the indifference of the great, the sneers of the wise, the enmity of the mass, and the persecution of a host of adversaries, high and low, he give up the thankless pursuit of his noble vision, what a hope for mankind is blasted! But he does not sink. He shakes off his enemies, as the lion shakes the dewdrops from his mane. That consciousness of motive and of strength, which always supports the man who is worthy to be supported, sustains him in his hour of trial; and, at length, after years of expectation, importunity, and hope deferred, he launches forth upon the unknown deep, to discover a new world under the patronage of Ferdinand and Isabella.

The patronage of Ferdinand and Isabella! Let us dwell for a moment on the auspices under which our country was

discovered. The patronage of Ferdinand and Isabella! Yes, doubtless, they have fitted out a convoy worthy the noble temper of the man and the grandeur of his project. Convinced at length that it is no day-dream of a heated visionary, the fortunate sovereigns of Castile and Aragon, returning from their triumph over the last of the Moors, and putting a victorious close to a war of seven centuries' duration, have no doubt prepared an expedition of well-appointed magnificence to go out upon this splendid search for other worlds. They have made ready, no doubt, their proudest galleon to waft the heroic adventurer upon his path of glory, with a whole armada of kindred spirits to accompany him.

Alas! from his ancient resort of Palos—which he first visited as a mendicant—in three frail barks, of which two were without decks, the great discoverer of America sails forth on the first voyage across the unexplored ocean! Such is the patronage of kings! A few years pass by; he discovers a new hemisphere; the wildest of his visions fade into insignificance before the reality of their fulfilment; he finds a new world for Castile and Leon, and comes back to Spain loaded with chains. Republics, it is said, are ungrateful. Such are the rewards of monarchies!

With this humble instrumentality did it please Providence to prepare the theatre for those events by which a new dispensation of liberty was to be communicated to man. But much is yet to transpire before even the commencement can be made in the establishment of those institutions by which this great advance in human affairs was to be effected. The discovery of America had taken place under the auspices of the government most disposed for maritime adventure, and best enabled to extend a helping

arm, such as it was, to the enterprise of the great discoverer. But it was not from the same quarter that the elements of liberty could be introduced into the New World. Causes, upon which I need not dwell, made it impossible that the great political reform should go forth from Spain. For this object, a new train of incidents was preparing in another quarter.

The only real advance which modern Europe had made in freedom had been made in England. The cause of constitutional liberty in that country was persecuted, was subdued, but not annihilated, nor trampled out of being. From the choicest of its suffering champions were collected the brave band of emigrants who first went out on the second, the more precious voyage of discovery—the discovery of a land where liberty and its consequent blessings might be established.

A late English writer has permitted himself to say that the original establishment of the United States, and that of the colony of Botany Bay, were modelled nearly on the same plan. The meaning of this slanderous insinuation is that the United States was settled by deported convicts, as New South Wales has been settled by transported felons. It is doubtless true that at one period the English Government was in the habit of condemning to hard labor, as servants in the colonies, a portion of those who had received the sentence of the law. If this practice makes it proper to compare America with Botany Bay, the same comparison might be made of England herself, before the practice of transportation began, and even now, inasmuch as a considerable number of convicts are at all times retained at home. In one sense, indeed, we might doubt whether the allegation were more of a reproach or a compliment. During the time

that the colonization of America was going on most rapidly, some of the best citizens of England, if it be any part of good citizenship to resist oppression, were immured in her prisons of State or lying at the mercy of the law.

Such were some of the convicts by whom America was settled—men convicted of fearing God more than they feared man; of sacrificing property, ease, and all the comforts of life, to a sense of duty and to the dictates of conscience; men convicted of pure lives, brave hearts, and simple manners. The enterprise was led by Raleigh, the chivalrous convict, who unfortunately believed that his royal master had the heart of a man, and would not let a sentence of death, which had slumbered for sixteen years, revive and take effect after so long an interval of employment and favor. But *nullum tempus occurrit regi.* The felons who followed next were the heroic and long-suffering Church of Robinson, at Leyden—Carver, Brewster, Bradford, Winslow, and their pious associates, convicted of worshipping God according to the dictates of their consciences, and of giving up all—country, property, and the tombs of their fathers—that they might do it unmolested. Not content with having driven the Puritans from her soil, England next enacted or put in force the oppressive laws which colonized Maryland with Catholics and Pennsylvania with Quakers. Nor was it long before the American plantations were recruited by the Germans, convicted of inhabiting the Palatinate, when the merciless armies of Louis XIV. were turned into that devoted region, and by the Huguenots, convicted of holding what they deemed the simple truth of Christianity, when it pleased the mistress of Louis XIV. to be very zealous for the Catholic faith. These were followed, in the next century, by the Highlanders, convicted

of the enormous crime, under a monarchical government, of loyalty to their hereditary prince on the plains of Culloden, and the Irish, convicted of supporting the rights of their country against what they deemed an oppressive external power. Such are the convicts by whom America was settled.

In this way, a fair representation of whatsoever was most valuable in European character—the resolute industry of one nation, the inventive skill and curious arts of another, the courage, conscience, principle, self-denial of all—was winnowed out, by the policy of the prevailing governments, as a precious seed wherewith to plant the American soil. By this singular coincidence of events, our country was constituted the great asylum of suffering virtue and oppressed humanity. It could now no longer be said—as it was of the Roman Empire—that mankind was shut up, as if in a vast prison house, from whence there was no escape. The political and ecclesiastical oppressors of the world allowed their persecution to find a limit at the shores of the Atlantic. They scarcely ever attempted to pursue their victims beyond its protecting waters. It is plain that in this way alone the design of Providence could be accomplished, which provided for one catholic school of freedom in the Western Hemisphere. For it must not be a freedom of too sectional and peculiar a cast. On the stock of the English civilization, as the general basis, were to be ingrafted the language, the arts, and the tastes of the other civilized nations. A tie of consanguinity must connect the members of every family of Europe with some portion of our happy land; so that in all their trials and disasters they may look safely beyond the ocean for a refuge. The victims of power, of intolerance, of war, of disaster, in every

other part of the world, must feel that they may find a kindred home within our limits. Kings, whom the perilous convulsions of the day have shaken from their thrones, must find a safe retreat; and the needy emigrant must at least not fail of his bread and water, were it only for the sake of the great discoverer, who was himself obliged to beg them. On this cornerstone the temple of our freedom was laid from the first—

> "For here the exile met from every clime,
> And spoke in friendship every distant tongue;
> Men, from the blood of warring Europe sprung,
> Were here divided by the running brook."

This peculiarity of our population, which some have thought a misfortune, is in reality one of the happiest circumstances attending the settlement of the country. It assures the exile from every part of Europe a kind reception from men of his own tongue and race. Had we been the unmixed descendants of any one nation of Europe, we should have retained a moral and intellectual dependence on that nation, even after the dissolution of our political connection had taken place. It was sufficient for the great purpose in view, that the earliest settlements were made by men who had fought the battles of liberty in England, and who brought with them the rudiments of constitutional freedom to a region where no deep-rooted prescriptions would prevent their development. Instead of marring the symmetry of our social system, it is one of its most attractive and beautiful peculiarities, that, with the prominent qualities of the Anglo-Saxon character inherited from our English fathers, we have an admixture of almost everything that is valuable in the character of most of the other States of Europe.

Such was the first preparation for the great political reform, of which America was to be the theatre. The Colonies of England—of a country where the supremacy of laws and the Constitution is best recognized—the North American Colonies—were protected from the first against the introduction of the unmitigated despotism which prevailed in the Spanish settlements—the continuance of which, down to the moment of their late revolt, prevented the education of these provinces in the exercise of political rights, and in that way has thrown them into the revolution inexperienced and unprepared—victims, some of them, to a domestic anarchy scarcely less grievous than the foreign yoke they have thrown off. While, however, the settlers of America brought with them the principles and feelings, the political habits and temper, which defied the encroachment of arbitrary power, and made it necessary, when they were to be oppressed, that they should be oppressed under the forms of law, it was an unavoidable consequence of the state of things—a result, perhaps, of the very nature of a Colonial government—that they should be thrown into a position of controversy with the mother country, and thus become familiar with the whole energetic doctrine and discipline of resistance. This formed and hardened the temper of the Colonists, and trained them up to a spirit meet for the struggles of separation.

On the other hand, by what I had almost called an accidental circumstance, but one which ought rather to be considered as a leading incident in the great train of events connected with the establishment of constitutional freedom in this country, it came to pass that nearly all the Colonies (founded as they were on the charters granted to corporate institutions in England, which had for their object the pur-

suit of the branches of industry and trade pertinent to a new plantation) adopted a regular representative system, by which, as in ordinary civil corporations, the affairs of the community are decided by the will and the voices of its members, or those authorized by them. It was no device of the parent government which gave us our colonial assemblies. It was no refinement of philosophical statesmen to which we are indebted for our republican institutions of government. They grew up, as it were, by accident, on the simple foundation I have named. "A House of Burgesses," says Hutchinson, "broke out in Virginia, in 1620;" and, "although there was no color for it in the charter of Massachusetts, a House of Deputies appeared suddenly in 1634." "Lord Say," observes the same historian, "tempted the principal men of Massachusetts to make themselves and their heirs nobles and absolute governors of a new colony, but under this plan they could find no people to follow them."

At this early period, and in this simple, unpretending manner, was introduced to the world that greatest discovery in political science, or political practice, a representative republican system. "The discovery of the system of the representative republic," says M. de Chateaubriand, "is one of the greatest political events that ever occurred." But it is not one of the greatest, it is the very greatest, and, combined with another principle, to which I shall presently advert, and which is also the invention of the United States, it marks an era in human affairs—a discovery in the great science of social life, compared with which everything else that terminates in the temporal interests of man sinks into insignificance.

Thus, then, was the foundation laid, and thus was the

preparation commenced, of the world's grand political regeneration. For about a century and a half, this preparation was carried on. Without any of the temptations which drew the Spanish adventurers to Mexico and Peru, the Colonies throve almost beyond example, and in the face of neglect, contempt, and persecution. Their numbers, in the substantial middle classes of life, increased with regular rapidity. They had no materials out of which an aristocracy could be formed, and no great eleemosynary establishments to cause an influx of paupers. There was nothing but the rewards of labor and the hope of freedom.

But at length this hope, never adequately satisfied, began to turn into doubt and despair. The Colonies had become too important to be overlooked; their government was a prerogative too important to be left in their own hands; and the legislation of the mother country decidedly assumed a form which announced to the patriots that the hour at length had come when the chains of the great discoverer were to be avenged, the sufferings of the first settlers to be compensated, and the long-deferred hopes of humanity to be fulfilled.

You need not, friends and fellow citizens, that I should dwell upon the incidents of the last great acts in the colonial drama. This very place was the scene of some of the earliest and the most memorable of them, and their recollection is a part of your inheritance of honor. In the early councils and first struggles of the great revolutionary enterprise, the citizens of this place were among the most prominent. The measures of resistance which were projected by the patriots of Charlestown were opposed by but one individual. An active co-operation existed between the political leaders in Boston and this place. The beacon light

which was kindled in the towers of Christ Church in Boston, on the night of the eighteenth of April, 1775, was answered from the steeple of the church in which we are now assembled. The intrepid messenger who was sent forward to convey to Hancock and Adams the intelligence of the approach of the British troops was furnished with a horse, for his eventful errand, by a respected citizen of this place. At the close of the following momentous day, the British forces —the remnant of its disasters—found refuge, under the shades of night, upon the heights of Charlestown; and there, on the ever-memorable seventeenth of June, that great and costly sacrifice in the cause of freedom was consummated with fire and blood. Your hilltops were strewed with illustrious dead; your homes were wrapped in flames; the fair fruits of a century and a half of civilized culture were reduced to a heap of bloody ashes, and two thousand men, women, and children turned houseless on the world. With the exception of the ravages of the nineteenth of April, the chalice of woe and desolation was in this manner first presented to the lips of the citizens of Charlestown. Thus devoted, as it were, to the cause, it is no wonder that the spirit of the Revolution should have taken possession of their bosoms, and been transmitted to their children. The American, who, in any part of the Union, could forget the scenes and the principles of the Revolution, would thereby prove himself unworthy of the blessings which he enjoys; but the citizen of Charlestown, who could be cold on this momentous theme, must hear a voice of reproach from the walls which were reared on the ashes of the seventeenth of June—a piercing cry from the very sods of yonder hill.

The Revolution was at length accomplished. The political separation of the country of Great Britain was ef-

fected, and it now remained to organize the liberty which had been reaped on bloody fields—to establish, in the place of the government whose yoke had been thrown off, a government at home, which should fulfil the great design of the Revolution and satisfy the demands of the friends of liberty at large. What manifold perils awaited the step! The danger was great that too little or too much would be done. Smarting under the oppressions of a distant government, whose spirit was alien to their feelings, there was great danger that the Colonies in the act of declaring themselves sovereign and independent States, would push to an extreme the prerogative of their separate independence, and refuse to admit any authority beyond the limits of each particular Commonwealth. On the other hand, achieving their independence under the banners of the Continental Army, ascribing, and justly, a large portion of their success to the personal qualities of the beloved Father of his Country, there was danger, not less imminent, that those who perceived the evils of the opposite extreme would be disposed to confer too much strength on one general government, and would, perhaps, even fancy the necessity of investing the hero of the Revolution, in form, with that sovereign power which his personal ascendency gave him in the hearts of his countrymen. Such and so critical was the alternative which the organization of the new government presented, and on the successful issue of which the entire benefit of this great movement in human affairs was to depend.

The first effort to solve the great problem was made in the course of the Revolution, and was without success. The Articles of Confederation verged to the extreme of a union too weak for its great purposes; and the moment the

pressure of this war was withdrawn, the inadequacy of this first project of a government was felt. The United States found themselves overwhelmed with debt, without the means of paying it. Rich in the materials of an extensive commerce, they found their ports crowded with foreign ships, and themselves without the power to raise a revenue. Abounding in all the elements of national wealth, they wanted resources to defray the ordinary expenses of government.

For a moment, and to the hasty observer, this last effort for the establishment of freedom had failed. No fruit had sprung from this lavish expenditure of treasure and blood. We had changed the powerful protection of the mother country into a cold and jealous amity, if not into a slumbering hostility. The oppressive principles against which our fathers had struggled were succeeded by more oppressive realities. The burden of the British Navigation Act, as it operated on the Colonies, was removed, but it was followed by the impossibility of protecting our shipping by a Navigation Act of our own. A state of material prosperity, existing before the Revolution, was succeeded by universal exhaustion; and a high and indignant tone of militant patriotism, by universal despondency.

It remained, then, to give its last great effort to all that had been done since the discovery of America for the establishment of the cause of liberty in the Western Hemisphere, and by another more deliberate effort to organize a government by which not only the present evils under which the country was suffering should be remedied, but the final design of Providence should be fulfilled. Such was the task that devolved on the statesmen who convened at Philadel-

phia on the second day of May, 1787, in the Assembly of which General Washington was elected president, and over whose debates your townsman, Mr. Gorham, presided for two or three months as chairman of the Committee of the Whole, during the discussion of the plan of the Federal Constitution.

The very first step to be taken was one of pain and regret. The old Confederation was to be given up. What misgivings and grief must not this preliminary sacrifice have occasioned to the patriotic members of the Convention! They were attached, and with reason, to its simple majesty. It was weak then, but it had been strong enough to carry the Colonies through the storms of the Revolution. Some of the great men who led up the forlorn hope of their country in the hour of her direst perils had died in its defence. Could not a little inefficiency be pardoned to a Union with which France had made an alliance, and England had made peace? Could the proposed new government do more or better things than this had done? Who could give assurance, when the flag of the Old Thirteen was struck, that the hearts of the people could be rallied to another banner?

Such were the misgivings of some of the great men of that day—the Henrys, the Gerrys, and other eminent anti-federalists, to whose scruples it is time that justice should be done. They were the sagacious misgivings of wise men, the just forebodings of brave men, who were determined not to defraud posterity of the blessings for which they had all suffered, and for which some of them had fought.

The members of that Convention, in going about the great work before them, deliberately laid aside the means by which all preceding legislators had aimed to accomplish

a like work. In founding a strong and efficient government, adequate to the raising up of a powerful and prosperous people, their first step was to reject the institutions in which other governments traced their strength and prosperity, or had, at least, regarded as the necessary conditions of stability and order. The world had settled down into the belief that a hereditary monarch was necessary to give strength to the executive power. The framers of our Constitution provided for an elective Chief Magistrate, chosen every four years. Every other country had been betrayed into the admission of a distinction of ranks in society, under the absurd impression that privileged orders are necessary to the permanence of the social system. The framers of our Constitution established everything on the purely natural basis of a uniform equality of the elective franchise, to be exercised by all the citizens at fixed and short intervals. In other countries it had been thought necessary to constitute some one political centre, toward which all political power should tend, and at which, in the last resort, it should be exercised. The framers of the Constitution devised a scheme of confederate and representative sovereign republics, united in a happy distribution of powers, which, reserving to the separate States all the political functions essential to local administrations and private justice, bestowed upon the general government those, and those only, required for the service of the whole.

Thus was completed the great revolutionary movement; thus was perfected that mature organization of a free system, destined, as we trust, to stand forever, as the exemplar of popular government. Thus was discharged the duty of our fathers to themselves, to the country, and to the world.

The power of the example thus set up, in the eyes of the nations, was instantly and widely felt. It was immediately made visible to sagacious observers that a constitutional age had begun. It was in the nature of things, that, where the former evil existed in its most inveterate form, the reaction should also be the most violent. Hence, the dreadful excesses that marked the progress of the French Revolution, and, for a while, almost made the name of liberty odious. But it is not less in the nature of things, that, when the most indisputable and enviable political blessings stand illustrated before the world—not merely in speculation and in theory, but in living practice and bright example—the nations of the earth, in proportion as they have eyes to see, and ears to hear, and hands to grasp, should insist on imitating the example. France clung to the hope of constitutional liberty through thirty years of appalling tribulation, and now enjoys the freest Constitution in Europe. Spain, Portugal, the two Italian kingdoms, and several of the German States, have entered on the same path. Their progress has been and must be various, modified by circumstances, by the interests and passions of governments and men, and, in some cases, seemingly arrested. But their march is as sure as fate. If we believe at all in the political revival of Europe, there can be no really retrograde movement in this cause; and that which seems so in the revolutions of government, is, like that of the heavenly bodies, a part of their eternal orbit.

There can be no retreat, for the great exemplar must stand, to convince the hesitating nations, under every reverse, that the reform they strive at is real, is practicable, is within their reach. Efforts at reform, by the power of action and reaction, may fluctuate; but there is an element

of popular strength abroad in the world, stronger than forms and institutions, and daily growing in power. A public opinion of a new kind has arisen among men—the opinion of the civilized world. Springing into existence on the shores of our own continent, it has grown with our growth and strengthened with our strength, till now, this moral giant, like that of the ancient poet, marches along the earth and across the ocean, but his front is among the stars. The course of the day does not weary, nor the darkness of the night arrest him. He grasps the pillars of the temple where Oppression sits enthroned, not groping and benighted, like the strong man of old, to be crushed, himself, beneath the fall, but trampling, in his strength, on the massy ruins.

Under the influence, I might almost say the unaided influence, of public opinion, formed and nourished by our example, three wonderful revolutions have broken out in a generation. That of France, not yet consummated, has left that country (which it found in a condition scarcely better than Turkey) in the possession of the blessings of a representative constitutional government. Another revolution has emancipated the American possessions of Spain, by an almost unassisted action of moral causes. Nothing but the strong sense of the age, that a government like that of Ferdinand ought not to subsist over regions like those which stretch to the south of us on the continent, could have sufficed to bring about their emancipation, against all the obstacles which the state of society among them opposes at present to regulated liberty and safe independence. When an eminent British statesman (Mr. Canning) said of the emancipation of these States, that "he had called into existence a new world in the West," he spoke as wisely as the artist who, having tipped the forks of a con-

ductor with silver, should boast that he had created the lightning, which it calls down from the clouds. But the greatest triumph of public opinion is the revolution of Greece. The spontaneous sense of the friends of liberty, at home and abroad—without armies, without navies, without concert, and acting only through the simple channels of ordinary communication, principally the press—has rallied the governments of Europe to this ancient and favored soil of freedom. Pledged to remain at peace, they have been driven by the force of public sentiment into the war. Leagued against the cause of revolution, as such, they have been compelled to send their armies and navies to fight the battles of revolt. Dignifying the barbarous oppressor of Christian Greece with the title of "ancient and faithful ally," they have been constrained, by the outraged feelings of the civilized world, to burn up, in time of peace, the navy of their ally, with all his antiquity and all his fidelity; and to cast the broad shield of the Holy Alliance over a young and turbulent republic.

This bright prospect may be clouded in; the powers of Europe, which have reluctantly taken, may speedily abandon the field. Some inglorious composition may yet save the Ottoman Empire from dissolution, at the sacrifice of the liberty of Greece, and the power of Europe. But such are not the indications of things. The prospect is fair that the political regeneration, which commenced in the West, is now going backward to resuscitate the once happy and long-deserted regions of the older world. The hope is not now chimerical, that those lovely islands, the flower of the Levant—the shores of that renowned sea, around which all the associations of antiquity are concentrated—are again to be brought back to the sway of civilization and Chris-

tianity. Happily, the interest of the great powers of Europe seems to beckon them onward in the path of humanity. The half-deserted coasts of Syria and Egypt, the fertile but almost desolated archipelago, the empty shores of Africa, the granary of ancient Rome, seem to offer themselves as a ready refuge for the crowded, starving, discontented millions of Western Europe. No natural nor political obstacle opposes itself to their occupation. France has long cast a wishful eye on Egypt. Napoleon derived the idea of his expedition, which was set down to the unchastened ambition of a revolutionary soldier, from a memoir found in the cabinet of Louis XIV. England has already laid her hand—an arbitrary, but a civilized and a Christian hand—on Malta; and the Ionian Isles, and Cyprus, Rhodes, and Claudia must soon follow. It is not beyond the reach of hope that a representative republic may be established in Central Greece and the adjacent islands. In this way, and with the example of what has been done, it is not too much to anticipate that many generations will not pass, before the same benignant influence will revisit the awakened East, and thus fulfil, in the happiest sense, the vision of Columbus, by restoring a civilized population to the primitive seats of our holy faith.

Fellow citizens, the eventful pages in the volume of human fortune are opening upon us with sublime rapidity of succession. It is two hundred years this summer since a few of that party who, in 1628, commenced in Salem the first settlement of Massachusetts, were sent by Governor Endicott to explore the spot where we stand. They found that one pioneer of the name of Walford had gone before them, and had planted himself among the numerous and warlike savages in this quarter. From them, the native

lords of the soil, these first hardy adventurers derived their title to the lands on which they settled, and, in some degree, prepared the way by the arts of civilization and peace; for the main body of the Colonists of Massachusetts came under Governor Winthrop, who, two years afterward, by a coincidence which you will think worth naming, arrived in Mystic River, and pitched his patriarchal tent on Ten Hills, upon the seventeenth day of June, 1630. Massachusetts at that moment consisted of six huts at Salem and one at this place. It seems but a span of time as the mind ranges over it. A venerable individual is living, at the seat of the first settlement, whose life covers one-half of the entire period; but what a destiny has been unfolded before our country! what events have crowded your annals! what scenes of thrilling interest and eternal glory have signalized the very spot where we stand!

In that unceasing march of things, which calls forward the successive generations of men to perform their part on the stage of life, we at length are summoned to appear. Our fathers have passed their hour of visitation—how worthily, let the growth and prosperity of our happy land and the security of our firesides attest. Or, if this appeal be too weak to move us, let the eloquent silence of yonder famous heights—let the column which is there rising in simple majesty—recall their venerable forms, as they toiled in the hasty trenches through the dreary watches of that night of expectation, heaving up the sods, where many of them lay in peace and honor before the following sun had set. The turn has come to us. The trial of adversity was theirs; the trial of prosperity is ours. Let us meet it as men who know their duty and prize their blessings. Our position is the most enviable, the most responsible, which

men can fill. If this generation does its duty, the cause of constitutional freedom is safe. If we fail—if we fail, not only do we defraud our children of the inheritance which we received from our fathers, but we blast the hopes of the friends of liberty throughout our continent, throughout Europe, throughout the world, to the end of time.

History is not without her examples of hard-fought fields, where the banner of liberty has floated triumphantly on the wildest storm of battle. She is without her examples of a people by whom the dear-bought treasure has been wisely employed and safely handed down. The eyes of the world are turned for that example to us. It is related by an ancient historian, of that Brutus who slew Cæsar, that he threw himself on his sword after the disastrous battle of Philippi, with the bitter exclamation, that he had followed virtue as a substance, but found it a name. It is not too much to say, that there are, at this moment, noble spirits in the elder world, who are anxiously watching the practical operation of our institutions, to learn whether liberty, as they have been told, is a mockery, a pretence, a curse—or a blessing, for which it became them to brave the scaffold and the cimeter.

Let us then, as we assemble on the birthday of the nation, as we gather upon the green turf, once wet with precious blood—let us devote ourselves to the sacred cause of Constitutional Liberty! Let us abjure the interests and passions which divide the great family of American freemen! Let the rage of party spirit sleep to-day! Let us resolve that our children shall have cause to bless the memory of their fathers, as we have cause to bless the memory of ours!

PHI BETA KAPPA ORATION

DELIVERED AT CAMBRIDGE, AUGUST 26, 1824

MR. PRESIDENT AND GENTLEMEN,— In discharging the honorable trust of being the public organ of your sentiments on this occasion, I have been anxious that the hour, which we here pass together, should be occupied by those reflections exclusively, which belong to us as scholars. Our association in this fraternity is academical; we engaged in it before our alma mater dismissed us from her venerable roof to wander in the various paths of life; and we have now come together in the academical holidays, from every variety of pursuit, from almost every part of our country, to meet on common ground as the brethren of one literary household. The professional cares of life, like the conflicting tribes of Greece, have proclaimed to us a short armistice, that we may come up in peace to our Olympia.

But from the wide field of literary speculation and the innumerable subjects of meditation which arise in it, a selection must be made. And it has seemed to me proper that we should direct our thoughts, not merely to a subject of interest to scholars, but to one which may recommend itself as peculiarly appropriate to us. If " that old man eloquent, whom the dishonest victory at Cheronæa killed with report," could devote fifteen years to the composition of his Panegyric on Athens, I shall need no excuse to a society of American scholars, in choosing for the theme of an address, on an occasion like this, the peculiar motives to intellectual exertion in America. In this subject that curiosity which every

scholar feels in tracing and comparing the springs of mental activity is heightened and dignified by the important connection of the inquiry with the condition and prospects of our native land.

In the full comprehension of the terms, the motives to intellectual exertion in a country embrace the most important springs of national character. Pursued into its details, the study of these springs of national character is often little better than fanciful speculation. The questions, why Asia has almost always been the abode of despotism, and Europe more propitious to liberty; why the Egyptians were abject and melancholy; the Greeks inventive, elegant, and versatile; the Romans stern, saturnine, and, in matters of literature, for the most part servile imitators of a people whom they conquered, despised, and never equalled; why tribes of barbarians from the North and East, not known to differ essentially from each other, at the time of their settlement in Europe, should have laid the foundation of national characters so dissimilar as those of the Spanish, French, German, and English nations,—these are questions to which a few general answers may be attempted, that will probably be just and safe only in proportion as they are vague and comprehensive.

Difficult as it is, even in the individual man, to point out precisely the causes, under the influence of which members of the same community and of the same family, placed apparently in the same circumstances, grow up with characters the most diverse; it is infinitely more difficult to perform the same analysis on a subject so vast as a nation; where it is first not a small question what the character is, before you touch the inquiry into the circumstances by which it was formed.

But as, in the case of individual character, there are certain causes of undisputed and powerful operation; there are also in national character causes equally undisputed of improvement and excellence on the one hand, and of degeneracy and decline on the other. The philosophical student of history, the impartial observer of man, may often fix on circumstances, which, in their operation on the minds of the people, in furnishing the motives and giving the direction to intellectual exertion, have had the chief agency in making them what they were or are. Nor are there many exercises of the speculative principle more elevated than this. It is in the highest degree curious to trace physical facts into their political, intellectual and moral consequences; and to show how the climate, the geographical position, and even the particular topography of a region connect themselves by evident association, with the state of society, its predominating pursuits, and characteristic institutions.

In the case of other nations, particularly of those which in the great drama of the world have long since passed from the stage, these speculations are often only curious. The operation of a tropical climate in enervating and fitting a people for despotism; the influence of a broad river or a lofty chain of mountains in arresting the march of conquest or of emigration, and thus becoming the boundary not merely of governments, but of languages, literature, institutions, and character; the effect of a quarry of fine marble on the progress of the liberal arts; the agency of popular institutions in promoting popular eloquence, and the tremendous reaction of popular eloquence on the fortunes of a state: the comparative destiny of colonial settlements, of insular states, of tribes fortified in nature's Alpine battlements, or scattered over a smiling region of olive gardens and vineyards; these are all

topics, indeed, of rational curiosity and liberal speculation, but important only as they may illustrate the prospects of our own country.

It is therefore when we turn the inquiry to our country, when we survey its features, search its history, and contemplate its institutions, to see what the motives are, which are to excite and guide the minds of the people; when we dwell not on a distant, an uncertain, an almost forgotten past; but on an impending future, teeming with life and action, toward which we are rapidly and daily swept forward, and with which we stand in the dearest connection, which can bind the generations of man together; a future, which our own characters, our own actions, our own principles will do something to stamp with glory or shame; it is then that the inquiry becomes practical, momentous, and worthy the attention of every patriotic scholar. We then strive, as far as it is in the power of philosophical investigation to do it, to unfold our country's reverend auspices, to cast its great horoscope in the national sky, where many stars are waning, and many have set; to ascertain whether the soil which we love, as that where our fathers are laid and we shall presently be laid with them, will be trod in times to come by a people virtuous, enlightened, and free.

The first of the circumstances which are acting and will continue to act with a strong peculiarity among us, and which must prove one of the most powerful influences in exciting and directing the intellect of the country, is the new form of civil society, which has here been devised and established. I shall not wander so far from the literary limits of this occasion, nor into a field so oft trodden, as the praises of free political institutions. But the direct and appropriate influence on mental effort of institutions like ours has not

yet, perhaps, received the attention, which, from every American scholar, it richly deserves.

I have ventured to say that a new form of civil society has here been devised and established. The ancient Grecian republics, indeed, were free enough within the walls of the single city, of which most of them were wholly or chiefly composed; but to these single cities the freedom, as well as the power, was confined. Toward the confederated or tributary states the government was generally a despotism more capricious and not less stern than that of a single tyrant. Rome as a state was never free; in every period of her history, authentic and dubious, royal, republican, and imperial, her proud citizens were the slaves of an artful, accomplished, wealthy aristocracy; and nothing but the hard-fought battles of her stern tribunes can redeem her memory to the friends of liberty. In ancient and modern history there is no example before our own, of a purely elective and representative system. It is therefore on an entirely novel plan, that, in this country, the whole direction and influence of affairs; all the trusts and honors of society; the power of making, abrogating, and administering the laws; the whole civil authority and sway, from the highest post in the government to the smallest village trust, are put directly into the market of merit.

Whatsoever efficacy there is in high station and exalted honors to call out and exercise the powers, either by awakening the emulation of the aspirants or exciting the efforts of the incumbents, is here directly exerted on the largest mass of men with the smallest possible deductions. Nothing is bestowed on the chance of birth, nothing depends on proximity to the fountain of honor, nothing is to be acquired by espousing hereditary family interests; but whatever is desired

must be sought in the way of a broad, fair, personal competition. It requires little argument to show that such a system must most widely and most powerfully have the effect of appealing to whatever of energy the land contains; of searching out, with magnetic instinct, in the remotest quarters the latent ability of its children.

It may be objected, and it has been, that for want of a hereditary government, we lose that powerful spring of action which resides in the patronage of such a government, and must emanate from the crown. With many individuals, friendly to our popular institutions, it is nevertheless an opinion, that we must consent to lose something of the genial influence of princely and royal patronage on letters and arts, and find our consolation in the political benefits of our free system.

It may be doubted, however, whether this view be not entirely false. A crown is in itself a strip of velvet set with jewels; the dignity which it imparts and the honor with which it is invested depend on the numbers, resources, and the intelligence of the people who permit it to be worn. The crown of the late emperor of Hayti is said to have been one of the most brilliant in the world; and Theodore of Corsica, while confined for debt in the Fleet in London, sat on as high a throne as the king of England.

Since then the power and influence of the crown are really in the people, it seems preposterous to say that what increases the importance of the people can diminish the effect of that which proceeds from them, depends upon them, and reverts to them. Sovereignty, in all its truth and efficacy, exists here as much as ever it did at London, at Paris, at Rome, or at Susa. It exists, it is true, in an equal proportionate diffusion; a part of it belongs to the humblest citizen. The error

seems to be in confounding the idea of sovereignty with the quality of an individual sovereign.

Wheresoever Providence gathers into a nation the tribes of men, there a social life with its energies and functions is conferred; and this social life is sovereignty. By the healthful action of our representative system it is made to pervade the empire like the air; to reach the farthest, descend to the lowest and bind the distant together; it is made not only to co-operate with the successful and assist the prosperous, but to cheer the remote, "to remember the forgotten, to attend to the neglected, to visit the forsaken."

Before the rising of our republic in the world, the faculties of men have had but one weary pilgrimage to perform—to travel up to court. By an improvement on the Jewish polity, which enjoined on the nation a visit thrice a year to the holy city; the great, the munificent, the enlightened states of the ancient and modern world have required a constant residence on the chosen spot. Provincial has become another term for inferior and rude; and impolite, which once meant only rural, has got to signify in all our languages something little better than barbarous.

But since in the nature of things a small part only of the population of a large state can by physical possibility be crowded within the walls of a city, and there receive the genial beams of metropolitan favor, it follows that the great mass of men are cut off from the operation of some of the strongest excitements to exertion.

It is rightfully urged, then, as a great advantage of our system, that the excitements of society go down as low as its burdens, and search out and bring forward whatsoever of ability and zeal are comprehended within the limits of the land. This is but the beginning of the benefit or rather it

is not yet the benefit. It is the effect of this diffusion of privileges that is precious. Capacity and opportunity, the twin sisters, who can scarce subsist but with each other, are now brought together.

The people who are to choose, and from whose number are to be chosen, by their neighbors, the highest officers of state, infallibly feel an impulse to mental activity; they read, think, and compare; they found village schools, they collect social libraries, they prepare their children for the higher establishments of education. The world, I think, has been abused on the tendency of institutions perfectly popular. From the ill-organized states of antiquity, terrific examples of license and popular misrule are quoted, to prove that man requires to be protected from himself, without asking who is to protect him from the protector, himself also a man.

While from the very first settlement of America to the present day, the most prominent trait of our character has been to cherish and diffuse the means of education. The village schoolhouse and the village church are the monuments which the American people have erected to their freedom; to read, and write and think are the licentious practices which have characterized our democracy.

But it will be urged, perhaps, that though the effect of our institutions be to excite the intellect of the nation, they excite it too much in a political direction; that the division and subdivision of the country into states and districts, and the equal diffusion throughout them of political privileges and powers, whatever favorable effect in other ways they may produce, are attended by this evil,—that they kindle a political ambition where it would not and ought not be felt; and particularly that they are unfriendly in their operation on literature, as they call the aspiring youth from the patient

and laborious vigils of the student to plunge prematurely into the conflicts of the forum.

It may, however, be doubted whether there be any foundation whatever for a charge like this; and whether the fact, so far as it is one, that the talent and ambition of the country incline at present to a political course be not owing to causes wholly unconnected with the free character of our institutions. It need not be said that the administration of the government of a country, whether it be liberal or despotic, is the first thing to be provided for. Some persons must be employed in making and administering the laws before any other interest can receive attention.

Our fathers, the pilgrims, before they left the vessel in which for five months they had been tossed on the ocean before setting foot on the new world of their desire, drew up a simple constitution of government. As this is the first care in the order of nature it ever retains its paramount importance.

Society must be preserved in its constituted forms, or there is no safety for life, no security for property, no permanence for any institution, civil, moral, or religious. The first efforts then of social men are of necessity political. Apart from every call of ambition, honorable or selfish, of interest enlarged or mercenary, the care of the government is the first care of a civilized community. In the early stages of social progress, where there is little property and a scanty population, the whole strength of the society must be employed in its support and defence. Though we are constantly receding from these stages we have not wholly left them. Even our rapidly increasing population is and will for some time remain small compared with the space over which it is diffused; and this with the total absence of large hereditary fortunes

will create a demand for political services on the one hand, and a necessity of rendering them on the other. There is, then, no ground for ascribing the political tendency of the talent and activity of this country to an imagined incompatibility of popular institutions with the profound cultivation of letters. Suppose our government were changed to-morrow; that the five points of a stronger government were introduced, a hereditary sovereign, an order of nobility, an established church, a standing army, and a vigilant police; and that these should take the place of that admirable system, which now, like the genial air, pervades all, supports all, cheers all, and is nowhere seen.

Suppose this change made, and other circumstances to remain the same; our population no more dense, our boundaries as wide, and the accumulation of private wealth no more abundant. Would there, in the new state of things, be less interest in politics? By the terms of the supposition, the leading class of the community, the nobles, are to be politicians by birth.

By the nature of the case a large portion of the remainder who gain their livelihood by their industry and talents would be engrossed, not indeed in the free political competition which now prevails, but in pursuing the interests of rival court factions. One class only, the peasantry, would remain, which would take less interest in politics than the corresponding class in a free state; or rather, this is a new class, which invariably comes in with a strong government; and no one can seriously think the cause of science and literature would be promoted by substituting an European peasantry in the place of, perhaps, the most substantial uncorrupted population on earth, the American yeomanry.

Moreover, the evil in question is with us a self-correcting

evil. If the career of politics be more open and the temptation to crowd it stronger, competition will spring up, numbers will engage in the pursuit; the less able, the less industrious, the less ambitious must retire and leave the race to the swift and the battle to the strong. But in hereditary governments no such remedy exists. One class of society, by the nature of its position, must be rulers, magistrates, or politicians. Weak or strong, willing or unwilling, they must play the game, though they, as well as the people, pay the bitter forfeit.

The obnoxious king can seldom shake off the empoisoned purple; he must wear the crown of thorns till it is struck off at the scaffold; and the same artificial necessity has obliged generations of nobles in all the old states of Europe to toil and bleed for a

"Power too great to keep or to resign."

Where the compulsion stops short of these afflicting extremities, still, under the governments in question, a large portion of the community is unavoidably destined to the calling of the courtier, the soldier, the party retainer; to a life of service, intrigue, and court attendance; and thousands, and those the prominent individuals in society, are brought up to look on a livelihood gained by private industry as base; on study as the pedant's trade, on labor as the badge of slavery.

I look in vain in institutions like these for anything essentially favorable to intellectual progress. On the contrary, while they must draw away the talent and ambition of the country quite as much as popular institutions can do it into pursuits foreign from the culture of the intellect, they necessarily doom to obscurity no small part of the mental energy of the land. For that mental energy has been equally diffused by sterner levellers than ever marched in the van of a

revolution; the nature of man and the Providence of God. Native character, strength, and quickness of mind are not of the number of distinctions and accomplishments that human institutions can monopolize within a city's walls. In quiet times they remain and perish in the obscurity to which a false organization of society consigns them. In dangerous, convulsed, and trying times they spring up in the fields, in the village hamlets, and on the mountain tops, and teach the surprised favorites of human law, that bright eyes, skilful hands, quick perceptions, firm purpose, and brave hearts, are not the exclusive appanage of courts.

Our popular institutions are favorable to intellectual improvement because their foundation is in dear nature. They do not consign the greater part of the social frame to torpidity and mortification. They send out a vital nerve to every member of the community by which its talents and power, great or small, are brought into living conjunction and strong sympathy with the kindred intellect of the nation; and every impression on every part vibrates with electric rapidity through the whole. They encourage nature to perfect her work; they make education, the soul's nutriment, cheap; they bring up remote and shrinking talent into the cheerful field of competition; in a thousand ways they provide an audience for lips which nature has touched with persuasion; they put a lyre into the hands of genius; they bestow on all who deserve it or seek it the only patronage worth having, the only patronage that ever struck out a spark of "celestial fire,"—the patronage of fair opportunity.

This is a day of improved education; new systems of teaching are devised; modes of instruction, choice of studies, adaptation of text-books, the whole machinery of means, have been brought in our day under severe revision. But were I to

attempt to point out the most efficacious and comprehensive improvement in education, the engine by which the greatest portion of mind could be brought and kept under cultivation, the discipline which would reach farthest, sink deepest, and cause the word of instruction, not to spread over the surface like an artificial hue carefully laid on, but to penetrate to the heart and soul of its objects, it would be popular institutions.

Give the people an object in promoting education, and the best methods will infallibly be suggested by that instinctive ingenuity of our nature which provides means for great and precious ends. Give the people an object in promoting education, and the worn hand of labor will be opened to the last farthing that its children may enjoy means denied to itself. This great contest about blackboards and sand-tables will then lose something of its importance, and even the exalted names of Bell and Lancaster may sink from that very lofty height where an over-hasty admiration has placed them.

But though it be conceded to us that the tendency which is alleged to exist in this country toward the political career is not a vicious effect of our free institutions, still it may be inquired whether the new form of social organization among us is at least to produce no corresponding modification of our literature? As the country advances, as the population becomes denser, as wealth accumulates, as the various occasions of a large, prosperous, and polite community call into strong action and vigorous competition the literary talent of the country, will no peculiar form or direction be given to its literature by the nature of its institutions? To this question an answer must without hesitation be given in the affirmative.

Literature as well in its origin as in its true and only genuine character is but a more perfect communication of man with man and mind with mind. It is a grave, sustained,

deliberate utterance of fact, of opinion, and feeling; or a free and happy reflection of nature, of characters, or of manners; and if it be not these it is poor imitation. It may therefore be assumed as certain that the peculiarity of our condition and institutions will be reflected in some peculiarity of our literature; but what that shall be it is as yet too early to say.

Literary history informs us of many studies which have been neglected as dangerous to existing governments, and many others which have been cultivated because they were prudent and safe. We have hardly the means of settling from analogy what direction the mind will most decisively take when left, under strong excitements, to action wholly without restraint from the arm of power. It is impossible to anticipate what garments our native muses will weave for themselves. To foretell our literature would be to create it.

There was a time before an epic poem, a tragedy, or a historical composition had ever been produced by the wit of man. It was a time of vast and powerful empires, of populous and wealthy cities. But these new and beautiful forms of human thought and feeling all sprang up in Greece under the stimulus of her free institutions. Before they appeared in the world it would have been idle for the philosopher to form conjectures as to the direction which the kindling genius of the age was to assume. He who could form could and would realize the anticipation, and it would cease to be an anticipation.

Assuredly epic poetry was invented then and not before, when the gorgeous vision of the Iliad, not in its full detail of circumstance, but in the dim conception of its leading scenes and sterner features, burst into the soul of Homer. Impossible, indeed, were the task fully to foretell the progress of

the mind under the influence of institutions as new, as peculiar, and far more animating than those of Greece.

But if, as no one will deny, our political system brings more minds into action on equal terms, if it provides a prompter circulation of thought throughout the community, if it gives weight and emphasis to more voices, if it swells to tens of thousands and millions those "sons of emulation who crowd the narrow strait where honor travels," then it seems not too much to expect some peculiarity at least, if we may not call it improvement, in that literature which is but the voice and utterance of all this mental action.

There is little doubt that the instrument of communication itself will receive great improvements; that the written and spoken language will acquire force and power; possibly that forms of address wholly new will be struck out to meet the universal demand for new energy. When the improvement or the invention (whatever it be) comes, it will come unlooked for, as well to its happy author as the world. But where great interests are at stake, great concerns rapidly succeeding each other, depending on almost innumerable wills, and yet requiring to be apprehended in a glance and explained in a word; where movements are to be given to a vast empire, not by transmitting orders, but by diffusing opinions, exciting feelings, and touching the electric chord of sympathy, there language and expression will become intense, and the old processes of communication must put on a vigor and a directness adapted to the aspect of the times.

Our country is called, as it is, practical; but this is the element for intellectual action. No strongly marked and high-toned literature, poetry, eloquence, or ethics, ever appeared but in the pressure, the din, and crowd of great interests, great enterprises, perilous risks, and dazzling rewards. States-

men, and warriors, and poets, and orators, and artists, start up under one and the same excitement. They are all branches of one stock. They form, and cheer, and stimulate, and, what is worth all the rest, understand each other; and it is as truly the sentiment of the student in the recesses of his cell as of the soldier in the ranks which breathes in the exclamation:

> "To all the sons of sense proclaim,
> One glorious hour of crowded life
> Is worth an age without a name."

But we are brought back to the unfavorable aspect of the subject by being reminded out of history of the splendid patronage which arbitrary governments have bestowed on letters, and which, from the nature of the case, can hardly be extended even to the highest merit under institutions like our own.

We are told of the munificent pensions, the rich establishments, the large foundations; of the museums erected, the libraries gathered, the endowments granted, by Ptolemys, Augustuses, and Louises of ancient and modern days. We are asked to remark the fruit of this noble patronage; wonders of antiquarian or scientific lore, Thesauruses and Corpuses, efforts of erudition from which the emulous student who would read all things, weigh all things, surpass all things, recoils in horror; volumes and shelves of volumes before which meek-eyed patience folds her hands in despair.

When we have contemplated these things and turn our thoughts back to our poor republican land, to our frugal treasury and the caution with which it is dispensed; to our modest fortunes and the thrift with which they are hoarded; to our scanty public libraries and the plain brick walls within which they are deposited, we may be apt to form gloomy auguries of the influence of free political institutions on our

literature. It is important then that we examine more carefully the experience of former ages and see how far their institutions, as they have been more or less popular, have been more or less associated with displays of intellectual excellence. When we make this examination, we shall be gratified to find that the precedents are all in favor of liberty.

The greatest efforts of human genius have been made where the nearest approach to free institutions has taken place. There shone forth not one ray of intellectual light to cheer the long and gloomy ages of the Memphian and Babylonian despots. Not a historian, not an orator, not a poet is heard of in their annals. When you ask what was achieved by the generations of thinking beings, the millions of men whose natural genius was as bright as that of the Greeks, nay, who forestalled the Greeks in the first invention of many of the arts, you are told that they built the pyramids of Memphis, the temples of Thebes, and the tower of Babylon, and carried Sesostris and Ninus upon their shoulders from the west of Africa to the Indus.

Mark the contrast in Greece. With the first emerging of that country into the light of political liberty the poems of Homer appear. Some centuries of political misrule and literary darkness follow, and then the great constellation of their geniuses seems to rise at once. The stormy eloquence and the deep philosophy, the impassioned drama and the grave history, were all produced for the entertainment of that "fierce democratie" of Athens. Here then the genial influence of liberty on letters is strongly put to the test. Athens was certainly a free state—free to licentiousness, free to madness. The rich were arbitrarily pillaged to defray the expenses of the state, the great were banished to appease the envy of their

rivals, the wise sacrificed to the fury of the populace. It was a state, in short, where liberty existed with most of the imperfections which have led men to love and praise despotism. Still, however, it was for this lawless, merciless people that the most chastised and accomplished literature which the world has known was produced.

The philosophy of Plato was the attraction which drew to a morning's walk in the olive gardens of the academy the young men of this factious city. Those tumultuous assemblies of Athens, the very same which rose in their wrath and to a man, and clamored for the blood of Phocion, required to be addressed, not in the cheap extemporaneous rant of modern demagogues, but in the elaborate and thrice repeated orations of Demosthenes. No! the noble and elegant arts of Greece grew up in no Augustan age, enjoyed neither royal nor imperial patronage. Unknown before in the world, strangers on the Nile, and strangers on the Euphrates, they sprang at once into life in a region not unlike our own New England—iron-bound, sterile, and free.

The imperial astronomers of Chaldæ went up almost to the stars in their observatories; but it was a Greek who first foretold an eclipse and measured the year. The nations of the East invented the alphabet, but not a line has reached us of profane literature in any of their languages; and it is owing to the embalming power of Grecian genius that the invention itself has been transmitted to the world. The Egyptian architects could erect structures which after three thousand five hundred years are still standing in their uncouth original majesty; but it was only on the barren soil of Attica that the beautiful columns of the Parthenon and the Theseum could rest, which are standing also. With the decline of liberty in Greece began the decline of all her letters

and all her arts; though her tumultuous democracies were succeeded by liberal and accomplished princes.

Compare the literature of the Alexandrian with that of the Periclean age; how cold, pedantic, and imitative! Compare, I will not say, the axes, the eggs, the altars, and the other frigid devices of the pensioned wits in the museum at Alexandria, but compare their best spirits with those of independent Greece: Callimachus with Pindar, Lycophron with Sophocles, Aristophanes of Byzantium with Aristotle, and Apollonius the Rhodian with Homer. When we descend to Rome, to the Augustan age, the exalted era of Mæcenas, we find one uniform work of imitation, often of translation. The choicest geniuses seldom rise beyond a happy transfusion of the Grecian masters. Horace translates Alcæus, Terence translates Menander, Lucretius translates Epicurus, Virgil translates Homer and Cicero—I had almost said, translates Demosthenes and Plato.

But the soul of liberty did burst forth from the lips of Cicero, "her form had not yet lost all its original brightness," her inspiration produced in him the only specimens of a purely original literature, which Rome has transmitted to us. After him, their literary history is written in one line of Tacitus: "*gliscente adulatione, magna ingenia deterrebantur.*"[1] The fine arts revived a little under the princes of the Flavian house, but never rose higher than a successful imitation of the waning excellence of Greece. With the princes of this line, the arts of Rome expired, and Constantine the Great was obliged to tear down an arch of Trajan for sculptures, wherewithal to adorn his own.

In modern times civilized states have multiplied; political institutions have varied in different states and at different

[1] As adulation increased, great geniuses declined.

times in the same state; some liberal institutions have existed in the bosom of societies otherwise despotic; and a great addition of new studies has been made to the encyclopædia, which have all been cultivated by great minds, and some of which, as the physical and experimental sciences, have little or no direct connection with the state of liberty. These circumstances perplex in some degree the inquiry into the effect of free institutions on intellectual improvement in modern times. There are times and places where it would seem that the muses, both the gay and the severe, had been transformed into court ladies.

Upon the whole, however, the modern history of literature bears but a cold testimony to the genial influence of the governments under which it has grown up. Dante and Petrarch composed their beautiful works in exile; Boccaccio complains in the most celebrated of his that he was transfixed with the darts of envy and calumny; Machiavelli was pursued by the party of the Medici for resisting their tyrannical designs; Guicciardini retired in disgust to compose his history in voluntary exile; Galileo confessed in the prisons of the Inquisition that the earth did not move; Ariosto lived in poverty; and Tasso died in want and despair.

Cervantes, after he had immortalized himself in his great work, was obliged to write on for bread. The whole French Academy was pensioned to crush the great Corneille. Racine, after living to see his finest pieces derided as cold and worthless, died of a broken heart. The divine genius of Shakespeare raised him to no higher rank than that of a subaltern actor in his own and Ben Jonson's plays. The immortal Chancellor was sacrificed to the preservation of a worthless minion, and is said (falsely I trust) to have begged a cup of beer in his old age, and begged it in vain. The most valuable of the

pieces of Selden were written in that famous resort of great minds, the Tower of London. Milton, surprised by want in his infirm old age, sold the first production of the human mind for five pounds. The great boast of English philosophy was expelled from his place in Oxford and kept in banishment, "the king having been given to understand," to use the words of Lord Sunderland, who ordered the expulsion, "that one Locke has, upon several occasions, behaved himself very factiously against the government." Dryden sacrificed his genius to the spur of immediate want. Otway was choked with a morsel of bread too ravenously swallowed after a long fast. Jonson was taken to prison for a debt of five shillings; and Burke petitioned for a professorship at Glasgow and was denied.

When we survey these facts and the innumerable others of which these are not even an adequate specimen we may perhaps conclude that in whatever way the arbitrary governments of Europe have encouraged letters it has not been in that of a steady cheering patronage. We may think there is abundant reason to acknowledge that the ancient lesson is confirmed by modern experience, and that popular institutions are most propitious to the full and prosperous growth of intellectual excellence.

If the perfectly organized system of liberty which here prevails be thus favorable to intellectual progress, various other conditions of our national existence are not less so, particularly the extension of one language, government, and character over so vast a space as the United States of America. Hitherto, in the main, the world has seen but two forms of social existence, free governments in small states and arbitrary governments in large ones. Though various shades of both have appeared at different times in the world, yet on the

whole, the political ingenuity of man has never found out the mode of extending liberal institutions beyond small districts, or of governing large empires by any other means than the visible demonstration and exercise of absolute power. The effect in either case has been unpropitious to the growth of intellectual excellence.

Free institutions, though favorable to the growth of intellectual excellence, are not the only thing needed. The wandering savage is free, but most of the powers of his mind lie dormant under the severe privations of a barbarous life. An infant colony on a distant coast may be free, but for want of the necessary mental aliment and excitement, may be unable to rise above the limits of material existence. In order then that free institutions may have their full and entire effect in producing the highest attainable degree of intellectual improvement, they require to be established in an extensive region and over a numerous people. This constitutes a state of society entirely new among men; a vast empire whose institutions are wholly popular.

While we experience the genial influence of those principles which belong to all free states, and in proportion as they are free; independence of thought and the right of expressing it; we are to feel in this country, we and those who succeed us, all that excitement which in various ways arises from the reciprocal action upon each other of the parts of a great empire. Literature, as has been partly hinted, is the voice of the age and the state. The character, energy, and resources of the country are reflected and imaged forth in the conceptions of its great minds. They are the organs of the time; they speak not their own language, they scarce think their own thoughts; but under an impulse like the prophetic enthusiasm of old they must feel and utter the sentiments which

society inspires. They do not create, they obey the Spirit of the Age; the serene and beautiful spirit descended from the highest heaven of liberty, who laughs at our little preconceptions, and, with the breath of his mouth, sweeps before him the men and the nations that cross his path.

By an unconscious instinct the mind in the strong action of its powers adapts itself to the number and complexion of the other minds with which it is to enter into communion or conflict. As the voice falls into the key which is suited to the space to be filled, the mind, in the various exercises of its creative faculties, strives with curious search for that master-note which will awaken a vibration from the surrounding community, and which, if it do not find, it is itself too often struck dumb.

For this reason, from the moment in the destiny of nations that they descend from their culminating point and begin to decline, from that moment the voice of creative genius is hushed, and at best, the age of criticism, learning, and imitation succeeds. When Greece ceased to be independent, the forum and the stage became mute. The patronage of Macedonian, Alexandrian, and Pergamean princes was lavished in vain. They could not woo the healthy muses of Hellas from the cold mountain tops of Greece to dwell in their gilded halls. Nay, though the fall of greatness, the decay of beauty, the waste of strength, and the wreck of power have ever been among the favorite themes of the pensive muse, yet not a poet arose in Greece to chant her own elegy; and it is after nearly three centuries and from Cicero and Sulpicius, that we catch the first notes of pious and pathetic lamentation over the fallen land of the arts. The freedom and genius of a country are invariably gathered into a common tomb, and there

> "Can only strangers breathe
> The name of that which was beneath."

It is when we reflect on this power of an auspicious future that we realize the prospect which smiles upon the intellect of America. It may justly be accounted the great peculiarity of ancient days compared with modern that in antiquity there was, upon the whole, but one civilized and literary nation at a time in the world. Art and refinement followed in the train of political ascendancy, from the East to Greece and from Greece to Rome.

In the modern world, under the influence of various causes, intellectual, political, and moral, civilization has been diffused throughout the greater part of Europe and America. Now mark a singular fatality as regards the connection of this enlarged and diffused civilization with the progress of letters and the excitement to intellectual exertion in any given state. Instead of one sole country, as in antiquity, where the arts and refinements find a home, there are, in modern Europe, seven or eight equally entitled to the general name of cultivated nations, and in each of which some minds of the first order have appeared. And yet, by the unfortunate multiplication of languages, an obstacle all but insuperable has been thrown in the way of the free progress of genius in its triumphant course from region to region. The muses of Shakespeare and Milton, of Camoens, of Lope de Vega, and Calderon, of Corneille and Racine, of Dante and Tasso, of Goethe and Schiller, are strangers to each other.

This evil was so keenly felt in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries that the Latin language was widely adopted as a dialect common to scholars. We see men like Luther, Calvin, and Erasmus, Bacon, Grotius, and Thuanus, who could scarce have written a line without exciting the admiration of their contemporaries, driven to the use of a tongue which none but the learned could understand.

For the sake of addressing the scholars of other countries these great men and others like them, in many of their writings, were obliged to cut themselves off from all sympathy with the mass of those whom as patriots they must have wished most to instruct. In works of pure science and learned criticism this is of less consequence, for being independent of sentiment it matters less how remote from real life the symbols in which their ideas are conveyed. But when we see a writer like Milton, who more than any other whom England ever produced, was a master of the music of his native tongue, who, besides all the eloquence of thought and imagery, knew better than any other man how to clothe them according to his own beautiful expression,—

> "In notes, with many a winding bout
> Of linked sweetness, long drawn out,
> With wanton heed and giddy cunning,
> The melting voice through mazes running,
> Untwisting all the chains that tie
> The hidden soul of harmony;"

—when we see a master of English eloquence thus gifted choosing a dead language, the dialect of the closet, a tongue without an echo from the hearts of the people, as the vehicle of his defence of that people's rights; asserting the cause of Englishmen in the language, as it may be truly called, of Cicero, we can only measure the incongruity by reflecting what Cicero would himself have thought and felt if called to defend the cause of Roman freedom, not in the language of the Roman citizen, but in that of the Chaldeans or Assyrians, or some people still farther remote in the history of the world.

There is little doubt that the prevalence of the Latin language among modern scholars was a great cause not only of the slow progress of letters among the lower ranks, but of the stiffness and constraint formerly visible in the vernacular style of most scholars themselves. That the reformation in

religion advanced with such rapidity is doubtless in no small degree to be attributed to the translation of the Scriptures and the use of liturgies in the modern tongues. While the preservation in England of a strange language—I will not sin against the majesty of Rome by calling it Latin—in legal acts, down to so late a period as 1730, may be one cause that the practical forms of administering justice have not been made to keep pace with the popular views that have triumphed in other things.

With the erection of popular institutions under Cromwell, among various other legal improvements, very many of which were speedily adopted by our plain-dealing forefathers, the records of the law were ordered to be kept in English; "a novelty." says the learned commentator on the English laws, "which at the Restoration was no longer continued, practisers having found it very difficult to express themselves so concisely or significantly in any other language but Latin;" an argument for the use of that language whose soundness it must be left to clients to estimate.

Nor are the other remedies more efficacious which have been attempted for the evil of a multiplicity of tongues. Something is done by translations and something by the acquisition of foreign languages. But that no effectual transfusion of the higher literature of a country can take place in the way of translation is matter of notoriety; and it is a remark of one of the few who could have courage to make such a remark, Madame de Staël, that it is impossible fully to comprehend the literature of a foreign tongue.

The general preference given to Young's "Night Thoughts" and Ossian over all the other English poets, in many parts of the continent of Europe, seems to confirm the justice of the observation. There is, indeed, an influence of exalted genius

co-extensive with the earth. Something of its power will be felt in spite of the obstacles of different languages, remote regions, and other times. But its true empire, its lawful sway, are at home and over the hearts of kindred men. A charm which nothing can borrow, nothing counterfeit, nothing dispense with, resides in the simple sound of our mother tongue.

Not analyzed nor reasoned upon it unites the earliest associations of life with the maturest conceptions of the understanding. The heart is willing to open all its avenues to the language in which its infantile caprices were soothed; and by the curious efficacy of the principal association it is this echo from the feeble dawn of life which gives to eloquence much of its manly power and to poetry much of its divine charm. This feeling of the music of our native language is the first intellectual capacity that is developed in children, and when by age or misfortune

> "The ear is all unstrung,
> Still, still, it loves the lowland tongue."

What a noble prospect is opened in this connection for the circulation of thought and sentiment in our country! Instead of that multiplicity of dialect by which mental communication and sympathy are cut off in the old world a continually expanding realm is opened and opening to American intellect in the community of our language throughout the widespread settlements of this continent. The enginery of the press will here for the first time be brought to bear with all its mighty power on the minds and hearts of men, in exchanging intelligence and circulating opinions, unchecked by the diversity of language, over an empire more extensive than the whole of Europe.

And this community of language, all important as it is, is but a part of the manifold brotherhood which unites and will unite the growing millions of America. In Europe, the worl

of international alienation which begins in diversity of language is carried on and consummated by diversity of government, institutions, national descent, and national prejudices. In crossing the principal rivers, channels, and mountains in that quarter of the world, you are met, not only by new tongues, but by new forms of government, new associations of ancestry, new and generally hostile objects of national boast and gratulation. While on the other hand, throughout the vast regions included within the limits of our republic not only the same language, but the same laws, the same national government, the same republican institutions, and a common ancestral association prevail and will diffuse themselves.

Mankind will here exist, move, and act in a kindred mass such as was never before congregated on the earth's surface. The necessary consequences of such a cause overpower the imagination. What would be the effect on the intellectual state of Europe at the present day were all her nations and tribes amalgamated into one vast empire, speaking the same tongue, united into one political system, and that a free one, and opening one broad unobstructed pathway for the interchange of thought and feeling from Lisbon to Archangel!

If effects are to bear a constant proportion to their causes; if the energy of thought is to be commensurate with the masses which prompt it and the masses it must penetrate; if eloquence is to grow in fervor with the weight of the interests it is to plead, and the grandeur of the assemblies it addresses; if efforts rise with the glory that is to crown them; in a word, if the faculties of the human mind, as we firmly believe, are capable of tension and achievement altogether indefinite,

"Nil actum reputans, dum quid superesset agendum." [1]

then it is not too much to say that a new era will open on

[1] "Counting nothing done as long as something still remained to be done."

the intellectual world in the fulfilment of our country's prospects.

By the sovereign efficacy of the partition of powers between the national and State governments, in virtue of which the national government is relieved from all the odium of internal administration, and the State governments are spared the conflicts of foreign politics, all bounds seem removed from the possible extension of our country but the geographical limits of the continent. Instead of growing cumbrous, as it increases in size, there never was a moment since the first settlement of Virginia, when the political system of America moved with so firm and bold a step as at the present day. If there is any faith in our country's auspices this great continent, in no remote futurity, will be filled up with a homogeneous population; with the mightiest kindred people known in history; our language will acquire an extension which no other ever possessed; and the empire of the mind, with nothing to resist its sway, will attain an expansion of which as yet we can but partly conceive.

The vision is too magnificent to be fully borne; a mass of two or three hundred millions, not chained to the oar like the same number in China by a brutalizing despotism, but held in their several orbits of nation and State by the grand representative attraction; bringing to bear on every point the concentrated energy of such a host; calling into competition so many minds; uniting into one great national feeling the hearts of so many freemen; all to be guided, persuaded, moved and swayed, by the master-spirits of the time!

Let me not be told that this is a chimerical imagination of a future indefinitely removed; let me not hear repeated the ribaldry of an anticipation of "two thousand years"—of a vision that requires for its fulfilment a length of ages beyond

the grasp of any reasonable computation. It is the last point of peculiarity in our condition to which I invite your attention as affecting the progress of intellect in the country, that it is growing with a rapidity hitherto entirely without example in the world. For the two hundred years of our existence the population has doubled itself in periods of less than a quarter of a century. In the infancy of the country, and while our numbers remained within the limits of a youthful colony, a progress so rapid as this, however important in the principle of growth disclosed, was not yet a circumstance strongly to fix the attention.

But arrived at a population of ten millions, it is a fact of the most overpowering interest that within less than twenty-five years these ten millions will have swelled to twenty; that the younger members of this audience will be citizens of the largest civilized State on earth; that in a few years more than one century the American population will equal the fabulous numbers of the Chinese empire.

This rate of increase has already produced the most striking phenomena. A few weeks after the opening of the revolutionary drama at Lexington, the momentous intelligence that the first blood was spilt reached a party of hunters beyond the Alleghanies who had wandered far into the western wilderness. In prophetic commemoration of the glorious event, they gave the name of Lexington to the spot of their encampment in the woods. That spot is now the capital of a State larger than Massachusetts; it is the seat of a university as fully attended as our venerable Alma Mater; nay, more, it is the capital of a State from which, in the language of one of her own citizens, whose eloquence is the ornament of his country, the tide of emigration still farther westward is more fully pouring than from any other in the Union.

I need not say that this astonishing increase of numbers is by no means the limit and measure of our country's growth. Arts, agriculture, all the great national interests, all the sources of national wealth, are growing in a ratio still more rapid. In our cities the intensest activity is apparent; in the country every spring of prosperity from the smallest improvement in husbandry to the construction of canals across the continent is in vigorous action; abroad our vessels are beating the pathways of the ocean white; on the inland frontier the nation is journeying on like a healthy giant with a pace more like romance than reality.

These facts, and thousands like them, form one of those peculiarities in our country's condition which will have the most powerful influence on the minds of its children. The population of several states of Europe has reached its term. In some it is declining, in some stationary, and in the most prosperous, under the extraordinary stimulus of the last part of the eighteenth century, it doubles itself but about once in seventy-five years. In consequence of this the process of social transmission is heavy and slow. Men, not adventitiously favored, come late into life, and the best years of existence are exhausted in languishing competition.

The man grows up, and in the stern language of one of their most renowned economists, Mr. Malthus, finds no cover laid for him at Nature's table. The smallest official provision is a boon at which great minds are not ashamed to grasp; the assurance of the most frugal subsistence commands the brightest talents and the most laborious studies; poor wages pay for the unremitted labor of the most curious hands; and it is the smallest part of the population only that is within the reach even of these humiliating springs of action.

We need not labor to contrast this state of things with the

teeming growth and noble expansion of all our institutions and resources. Instead of being shut up, as it were, in the prison of a stationary or a very slowly progressive community, the emulation of our countrymen is drawn out and tempted on by a horizon constantly receding before them.

New nations of kindred freemen are springing up in successive periods, shorter even than the active portion of the life of man. "While we spend our time," says Burke on this topic, "in deliberating on the mode of governing two millions in America, we shall find we have millions more to manage." Many individuals are in this house who were arrived at years of discretion when these words of Burke were uttered, and the two millions which Great Britain was then to manage have grown into ten, exceedingly unmanageable. The most affecting view of this subject is that it puts it in the power of the wise, and good, and great to gather while they live the ripest fruits of their labors.

Where in human history is to be found a contrast like that which the last fifty years have crowded into the lives of those favored men, who raising their hands or their voices when our little bands were led out to the perilous conflict with one of the most powerful empires on earth have lived to be crowned with the highest honors of the republic which they established? Honor to their gray hairs, and peace and serenity to the evening of their eventful days!

Though it may never again be the fortune of our country to bring within the compass of half a century a contrast so dazzling as this, yet in its grand and steady progress the career of duty and usefulness will be run by all its children under a constantly increasing stimulus. The voice which in the morning of life shall awaken the patriotic sympathy of the land will be echoed back by a community, incalculably

swelled in all its proportions, before it shall be hushed in death. The writer by whom the noble features of our scenery shall be sketched with a glowing pencil, the traits of our romantic early history gathered up with filial zeal, and the peculiarities of our character seized with delicate perception, cannot mount so entirely and rapidly to success but that ten years will add new millions to the numbers of his readers. The American statesman, the orator whose voice is already heard in its supremacy from Florida to Maine, whose intellectual empire already extends beyond the limits of Alexander's, has yet new states and new nations starting into being, the willing tributaries to his sway.

This march of our population westward has been attended with consequences in some degree novel in the history of the human mind. It is a fact, somewhat difficult of explanation, that the refinement of the ancient nations seemed almost wholly devoid of an elastic and expansive principle.

The arts of Greece were enchained to her islands and her coasts, they did not penetrate the interior. The language and literature of Athens were as unknown to the north of Pindus at a distance of two hundred miles from the capital of Grecian refinement as they were in Scythia. Thrace, whose mountain tops may almost be seen from the porch of the temple of Minerva at Sunium, was the proverbial abode of barbarism. Though the colonies of Greece were scattered on the coasts of Italy, of France, of Spain, and of Africa, no extension of their population toward the interior took place, and the arts did not penetrate beyond the walls of the cities where they were cultivated. How different is the picture of the diffusion of the arts and improvement of civilization from the coast to the interior of America!

Population advances westward with a rapidity which num-

bers may describe indeed but cannot represent with any vivacity to the mind. The wilderness, which one year is impassable is traversed the next by the caravans of the industrious emigrants, who go to follow the setting sun, with the language, the institutions, and the arts of civilized life. It is not the irruption of wild barbarians come to visit the wrath of God on a degenerate empire; it is not the inroad of disciplined banditti, marshalled by the intrigues of ministers and kings. It is the human family led out to possess its broad patrimony.

The states and nations which are springing up in the valley of the Missouri are bound to us by the dearest ties of a common language, a common government, and a common descent. Before New England can look with coldness on their rising myriads she must forget that some of the best of her own blood is beating in their veins; that her hardy children with their axes on their shoulders have been literally among the pioneers in this march of humanity; that young as she is she has become the mother of populous states.

What generous mind would sacrifice to a selfish preservation of local preponderance the delight of beholding civilized nations rising up in the desert; and the language, the manners, the institutions, to which he has been reared carried with his household gods to the foot of the Rocky Mountains? Who can forget that this extension of our territorial limits is the extension of the empire of all we hold dear; of our laws, of our character, of the memory of our ancestors, of the great achievements in our history? Whithersoever the sons of the thirteen States shall wander, to southern or western climes, they will send back their hearts to the rocky shores, the battle fields, and the intrepid counsels of the Atlantic coast. These are placed beyond the reach of vicissitude.

They have become already matter of history, of poetry, of eloquence:

> "The love, where death has set his seal,
> Nor age can chill, nor rival steal,
> Nor falsehood disavow."

Divisions may spring up, ill blood arise, parties be formed, and interests may seem to clash; but the great bonds of the nation are linked to what is passed. The deeds of the great men to whom this country owes its origin and growth are a patrimony, I know, of which its children will never deprive themselves. As long as the Mississippi and the Missouri shall flow those men and those deeds will be remembered on their banks. The sceptre of government may go where it will; but that of patriotic feeling can never depart from Judah. In all that mighty region which is drained by the Missouri and its tributary streams—the valley coextensive with the temperate zone—will there be, as long as the name of America shall last, a father that will not take his children on his knee and recount to them the events of the twentieth of December, the nineteenth of April, the seventeenth of June, and the fourth of July?

This then is the theatre on which the intellect of America is to appear, and such the motives to its exertion; such the mass to be influenced by its energies, such the crowd to witness its efforts, such the glory to crown its success. If I err in this happy vision of my country's fortunes I thank God for an error so animating. If this be false may I never know the truth. Never may you, my friends, be under any other feeling, than that a great, a growing, an immeasurably expanding country is calling upon you for your best services. The name and character of your Alma Mater have already been carried by some of our brethren thousands of miles from her venerable walls; and thousands of miles still farther west-

ward the communities of kindred men are fast gathering, whose minds and hearts will act in sympathy with yours.

The most powerful motives call on us as scholars for those efforts which our common country demands of all her children. Most of us are of that class who owe whatever of knowledge has shone into our minds to the free and popular institutions of our native land. There are few of us who may not be permitted to boast that we have been reared in an honest poverty or a frugal competence and owe everything to those means of education which are equally open to all. We are summoned to new energy and zeal by the high nature of the experiment we are appointed in Providence to make, and the grandeur of the theatre on which it is to be performed.

When the old world afforded no longer any hope it pleased heaven to open this last refuge of humanity. The attempt has begun, and is going on, far from foreign corruption, on the broadest scale and under the most benignant auspices; and it certainly rests with us to solve the great problem in human society, to settle, and that forever, the momentous question—whether mankind can be trusted with a purely popular system?

One might almost think, without extravagance, that the departed wise and good of all places and times are looking down from their happy seats to witness what shall now be done by us; that they who lavished their treasures and their blood of old, who labored and suffered, who spake and wrote, who fought and perished in the one great cause of freedom and truth, are now hanging from their orbs on high over the last solemn experiment of humanity.

As I have wandered over the spots, once the scene of their labors, and mused among the prostrate columns of their

senate houses and forums, I have seemed almost to hear a voice from the tombs of departed ages; from the sepulchres of the nations, which died before the sight. They exhort us, they adjure us to be faithful to our trust. They implore us by the long trials of struggling humanity, by the blessed memory of the departed, by the dear faith which has been plighted by pure hands to the holy cause of truth and man; by the awful secrets of the prison houses where the sons of freedom have been immured, by the noble heads which have been brought to the block, by the wrecks of time, by the eloquent ruins of nations, they conjure us not to quench the light which is rising on the world.

Greece cries to us by the convulsed lips of her poisoned, dying Demosthenes; and Rome pleads with us in the mute persuasion of her mangled Tully. They address us each and all in the glorious language of Milton, to one who might have canonized his memory in the hearts of the friends of liberty, but who did most shamefully betray the cause:

"Reverere tantam de te expectationem, spem patriæ de te unicam. Reverere vultus et vulnera tot fortium virorum, quotquot pro libertate tam strenue decertarunt, manes etiam eorum qui in ipso certamine occubuerunt. Reverere exterarum quoque civitatum existimationem de te atque sermones; quantas res de libertate nostra tam fortiter parta, de nostra republica tam gloriose exorta sibi polliceantur; quæ si tam cito quasi aborta evanuerit, profecto nihil æque dedecorosum huic genti atque periculosum fuerit."[1]

Yes, my friends, such is the exhortation which calls on us to exert our powers, to employ our time, and consecrate our labors in the cause of our native land. When we engage in that solemn study, the history of our race; when we survey the progress of man, from his cradle in the East to these last

[1] Milton's "Defensio Secunda."

limits of his wandering; when we behold him forever flying westward from civil and religious thraldom, bearing his household gods over mountains and seas, seeking rest and finding none, but still pursuing the flying bow of promise to the glittering hills which it spans in Hesperian climes, we cannot but exclaim with Bishop Berkeley, the generous prelate of England who bestowed his benefactions as well as blessings on our country,

> "Westward the star of Empire takes its way;
> The four first acts already past,
> The fifth shall close the drama with the day;
> Time's noblest offspring is the last."

In that high romance, if romance it be, in which the great minds of antiquity sketched the fortunes of the ages to come, they pictured to themselves a favored region beyond the ocean, a land of equal laws and happy men. The primitive poets beheld it in the islands of the blest; the Doric bards surveyed it in the Hyperborean regions; the sage of the academy placed it in the lost Atlantis; and even the sterner spirit of Seneca could discern a fairer abode of humanity in distant regions then unknown. We look back upon these uninspired predictions and almost recoil from the obligation they imply. By us must these fair visions be realized, by us must be fulfilled these high promises which burst in trying hours from the longing hearts of the champions of truth. There are no more continents or worlds to be revealed; Atlantis hath arisen from the ocean, the farthest Thule is reached, there are no more retreats beyond the sea, no more discoveries, no more hopes. Here then a mighty work is to be fulfilled, or never by the race of mortals. The man who looks with tenderness on the sufferings of good men in other times, the descendant of the pilgrims who cherishes the memory of his fathers, the patriot who feels an honest glow at the majesty of the system

of which he is a member, the scholar who beholds with rapture the long sealed book of unprejudiced truth expanded to all to read, these are they by whom these auspices are to be accomplished. Yes, brethren, it is by the intellect of the country that the mighty mass is to be inspired, that its parts are to communicate and sympathize, its bright progress to be adorned with becoming refinements, its strong sense uttered, its character reflected, its feelings interpreted to its own children, to other regions, and to after ages.

Meantime the years are rapidly passing away and gathering importance in their course. With the present year will be completed the half century from that most important era in human history, the commencement of our revolutionary war. The jubilee of our national existence is at hand. The space of time that has elapsed from that momentous date has laid down in the dust, which the blood of many of them had already hallowed, most of the great men to whom under Providence we owe our national existence and privileges. A few still survive among us to reap the rich fruits of their labors and sufferings; and one[1] has yielded himself to the united voice of a people and returned in his age to receive the gratitude of the nation to whom he devoted his youth. It is recorded on the pages of American history that when this friend of our country applied to our commissioners at Paris, in 1776, for a passage in the first ship they should despatch to America they were obliged to answer him (so low and abject was then our dear native land), that they possessed not the means nor the credit sufficient for providing a single vessel in all the ports of France. Then, exclaimed the youthful hero, "I will provide my own;" and it is a literal fact that

[1] Major-General La Fayette, who was present at the delivery of this oration.

when all America was too poor to offer him so much as a passage to our shores, he left, in his tender youth, the bosom of home, of happiness, of wealth, of rank, to plunge in the dust and blood of our inauspicious struggle.

Welcome, friend of our fathers, to our shores! Happy are our eyes that behold those venerable features. Enjoy a triumph such as never conqueror or monarch enjoyed, the assurance, that throughout America, there is not a bosom which does not beat with joy and gratitude at the sound of your name. You have already met and saluted, or will soon meet, the few that remain of the ardent patriots, prudent counsellors, and brave warriors with whom you were associated in achieving our liberty. But you have looked round in vain for the faces of many who would have lived years of pleasure on a day like this with their old companion in arms and brother in peril. Lincoln, and Greene, and Knox, and Hamilton, are gone; the heroes of Saratoga and Yorktown have fallen before the only foe they could not meet. Above all, the first of heroes and of men, the friend of your youth, the more than friend of his country, rests in the bosom of the soil he redeemed. On the banks of his Potomac he lies in glory and peace. You will revisit the hospitable shades of Mount Vernon, but him whom you venerated as we did you will not meet at its door. His voice of consolation, which reached you in the Austrian dungeons, cannot now break its silence to bid you welcome to his own roof. But the grateful children of America will bid you welcome, in his name. Welcome, thrice welcome to our shores; and whithersoever throughout the limits of the continent your course shall take you, the ear that hears you shall bless you, the eye that sees you shall bear witness to you, and every tongue exclaim, with heartfelt joy, welcome, welcome La Fayette!

PATRIOTIC ORATION

DELIVERED AT CAMBRIDGE ON THE FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE INDEPENDENCE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

FELLOW CITIZENS,—It belongs to us with strong propriety to celebrate this day. The town of Cambridge and the county of Middlesex are filled with the vestiges of the revolution; whithersoever we turn our eyes we behold some memento of its glorious scenes. Within the walls in which we are now assembled was convened the first provincial Congress after its adjournment at Concord. The rural magazine at Medford reminds us of one of the earliest acts of British aggression.

The march of both divisions of the royal army on the memorable 19th of April was through the limits of Cambridge; in the neighboring towns of Lexington and Concord the first blood of the revolution was shed; in West Cambridge the royal convoy of provisions was, the same day, gallantly surprised by the aged citizens who stayed to protect their homes while their sons pursued the foe.

Here the first American army was formed; from this place, on the 17th of June, was detached the Spartan band that immortalized the heights of Charlestown and consecrated that day with blood and fire to the cause of American liberty. Beneath the venerable elm which still shades the southwestern corner of the common General Washington first unsheathed his sword at the head of an American army, and to that seat was wont every Sunday to repair to join in the supplications which were made for the welfare of his country.

How changed is now the scene! The foe is gone! The din and the desolation of war are passed; science has long resumed her station in the shades of our venerable university, no longer glittering with arms; the anxious war council is no longer in session, to offer a reward for the discovery of the best mode of making saltpetre—an unpromising stage of hostilities when an army of twenty thousand men is in the field in front of the foe; the tall grass now waves in the trampled sallyport of some of the rural redoubts that form a part of the simple lines of circumvallation within which a half-armed American militia held the flower of the British army blockaded; the plough has done what the English batteries could not do—has levelled others of them with the earth; and the men, the great and good men, their warfare is over and they have gone quietly down to the dust they redeemed from oppression.

At the close of a half century since the declaration of our independence we are assembled to commemorate that great and happy event. We come together, not because it needs, but because it deserves these acts of celebration. We do not meet each other and exchange our felicitations because we should otherwise fall into forgetfulness of this auspicious era, but because we owe it to our fathers and to our children to mark its return with grateful festivities.

The major part of this assembly is composed of those who had not yet engaged in the active scenes of life when the revolution commenced. We come not to applaud our own work but to pay a filial tribute to the deeds of our fathers. It was for their children that the heroes and sages of the revolution labored and bled. They were too wise not to know that it was not personally their own cause in which they were embarked; they felt that they were engaging in

an enterprise which an entire generation must be too short to bring to its mature and perfect issue.

The most they could promise themselves was, that, having cast forth the seed of liberty, having shielded its tender germ from the stern blasts that beat upon it, having watered it with the tears of waiting eyes and the blood of brave hearts, their children might gather the fruit of its branches, while those who planted it should molder in peace beneath its shade.

Nor was it only in this that we discern their disinterestedness, their heroic forgetfulness of self. Not only was the independence for which they struggled a great and arduous adventure, of which they were to encounter the risk and others to enjoy the benefits, but the oppressions which roused them had assumed in their day no worse form than that of a pernicious principle. No intolerable acts of oppression had ground them to the dust. They were not slaves rising in desperation from beneath the agonies of the lash, but free men, snuffing from afar "the tainted gale of tyranny."

The worst encroachments on which the British ministry had ventured might have been borne consistently with the practical enjoyment of many of the advantages resulting from good government. On the score of calculation alone that generation had much better have paid the duties on glass, painter's colors, stamped paper, and tea, than have plunged into the expenses of the revolutionary war.

But they thought not of shuffling off upon posterity the burden of resistance. They well understood the part which Providence had assigned to them. They perceived that they were called to discharge a high and perilous office to the cause of freedom; that their hands were elected to strike the blow for which near two centuries of preparation—never remitted though often unconscious—had been making on one side or

the other of the Atlantic. They felt that the colonies had now reached that stage in their growth when the difficult problem of colonial government must be solved; difficult I call it, for such it is to the statesman whose mind is not sufficiently enlarged for the idea that a wise colonial government must naturally and rightfully end in independence; that even a mild and prudent sway on the part of the mother country furnishes no reason for not severing the bands of the colonial subjection; and that when the rising state has passed the period of adolescence the only alternative which remains is that of a peaceable separation or a convulsive rupture.

The British ministry, at that time weaker than it had ever been since the infatuated reign of James II, had no knowledge of political science but that which they derived from the text of official records. They drew their maxims, as it was happily said of one of them that he did his measures, from the file. They heard that a distant province had resisted the execution of an act of Parliament. Indeed, and what is the specific in cases of resistance?—a military force; and two more regiments are ordered to Boston. Again they hear that the general court of Massachusetts Bay has taken counsels subversive of the allegiance due to the crown. A case of a refractory corporation; what is to be done? First try a mandamus, and if that fails seize the franchises into his Majesty's hands.

They never asked the great questions, whether nations, like men, have not their principles of growth; whether Providence has assigned no laws to regulate the changes in the condition of that most astonishing of human things, a nation of kindred men. They did not inquire, I will not say whether it were rightful and expedient, but whether it were practicable, to give law across the Atlantic to a people who possessed within

themselves every imaginable element of self-government—a people rocked in the cradle of liberty, brought up to hardship, inheriting nothing but their rights on earth and their hopes in heaven.

But though the rulers of Britain appear not to have caught a glimpse of the great principles involved in these questions, our fathers had asked and answered them. They perceived with the rapidity of intuition that the hour of separation had come; because a principle was assumed by the British government which put an instantaneous check to the further growth of liberty. Either the race of civilized man happily planted on our shores, at first slowly and painfully reared, but at length auspiciously multiplying in America, is destined never to constitute a free and independent state; or these measures must be resisted which go to bind it in a mild but abject colonial vassalage.

Either the hope must be forever abandoned, the hope that had been brightening and kindling toward assurance like the glowing skies of the morning—the hope that a new centre of civilization was to be planted on the new continent at which the social and political institutions of the world may be brought to the standard of reason and truth after thousands of years of degeneracy—either this hope must be abandoned, and forever, or the battle was now to be fought, first in the political assemblies and then, if need be, in the field.

In the halls of legislation scarcely can it be said that the battle was fought. A spectacle indeed seemed to be promised to the civilized world of breathless interest and uncalculated consequence. "You are placed," said the provincial Congress of Massachusetts in their address to the inhabitants, of December 4, 1774, an address promulgated at the close of a session held in this very house where we are now convened,

"You are placed by Providence in a post of honor because it is a post of danger, and while struggling for the noblest objects, the liberties of our country, the happiness of posterity, and the rights of human nature, the eyes, not only of North America and the whole British empire, but of all Europe are upon you."

A mighty question of political right was at issue between the two hemispheres. Europe and America in the face of mankind are going to plead the great cause on which the fate of popular government forever is suspended. One circumstance, and one alone, exists to diminish the interest of the contention—the perilous inequality of the parties—an inequality far exceeding that which gives animation to a contest, and so great as to destroy the hope of an ably waged encounter.

On the one side were arrayed the two houses of the British Parliament, the modern school of political eloquence, the arena where great minds had for a century and a half strenuously wrestled themselves into strength and power, and in better days the common and upright chancery of an empire on which the sun never set.

Upon the other side rose up the colonial assemblies of Massachusetts and Virginia, and the Continental Congress of Philadelphia, composed of men whose training had been within a small provincial circuit, who had never before felt the inspiration which the consciousness of a station before the world imparts; who brought no power into the contest but that which they drew from their cause and their bosoms.

It is by champions like these that the great principles of representative government, of chartered rights and constitutional liberty are to be discussed; and surely never in the annals of national controversy was exhibited a triumph so

complete of the seemingly weaker party, a rout so disastrous of the stronger. Often as it has been repeated, it will bear another repetition; it never ought to be omitted in the history of constitutional liberty; it ought especially to be repeated this day; the various addresses, petitions, and appeals, the correspondence, the resolutions, the legislative and popular debates, from 1764 to the Declaration of Independence, present a maturity of political wisdom, a strength of argument, a gravity of style, a manly eloquence, and a moral courage, of which unquestionably the modern world affords no other example.

This meed of praise, substantially accorded at the time by Chatham, in the British Parliament, may well be repeated by us. For most of the venerated men to whom it is paid it is but a pious tribute to departed worth. The Lees and the Henrys, Otis, Quincy, Warren, and Samuel Adams, the men who spoke those words of thrilling power which raised and ruled the storm of resistance and rang like the voice of fate across the Atlantic, are beyond the reach of our praise.

To most of them it was granted to witness some of the fruits of their labors; such fruit as revolutions do not often bear. Others departed at an untimely hour or nobly fell in the onset; too soon for their country, too soon for liberty, too soon for everything but their own undying fame. But all are not gone; some still survive among us—the favored, enviable men—to hail the jubilee of the independence they declared, Go back, fellow citizens, to that day when Jefferson and Adams composed the sub-committee who reported the Declaration of Independence.

Think of the mingled sensations of that proud but anxious day compared to the joy of this. What honor, what crown, what treasure could the world and all its kingdoms afford,

compared with the honor and happiness of having been united in that commission and living to see its most wavering hopes turned into glorious reality. Venerable men! you have outlived the dark days which followed your more than heroic deed; you have outlived your own strenuous contention who should stand first among the people whose liberty you vindicated. You have lived to bear to each other the respect which the nation bears to you both; and each has been so happy as to exchange the honorable name of the leader of a party for that more honorable one, the Father of his Country. While this our tribute of respect on the jubilee of our independence is paid to the gray hairs of the venerable survivor in our neighborhood, let it not less heartily be sped to him whose hand traced the lines of that sacred charter which to the end of time has made this day illustrious. And is an empty profession of respect all that we owe to the man who can show the original draught of the Declaration of the Independence of the United States of America in his own handwriting? Ought not a title-deed like this to become the acquisition of the nation? Ought it not to be laid up in the archives of the people? Ought not the price at which it is bought to be the ease and comfort of the old age of him who drew it? Ought not he, who at the age of thirty declared the independence of his country, at the age of eighty to be secured by his country in the enjoyment of his own?

Nor let us forget on the return of this eventful day the men who, when the conflict of counsel was over, stood forward in that of arms. Yet let me not by faintly endeavoring to sketch do deep injustice to the story of their exploits. The efforts of a life would scarce suffice to paint out this picture in all its astonishing incidents, in all its mingled colors of sublimity and woe, of agony and triumph. But the age of

commemoration is at hand. The voice of our fathers' blood begins to cry to us from beneath the soil which it moistened.

Time is bringing forward in their proper relief the men and the deeds of that high-souled day. The generation of contemporary worthies is gone; the crowd of the unsignalized great and good disappears; and the leaders in war as well as council are seen, in fancy's eye, to take their stations on the mount of remembrance.

They come from the embattled cliffs of Abraham; they start from the heaving sods of Bunker's Hill; they gather from the blazing lines of Saratoga and Yorktown, from the blood-dyed waters of the Brandywine, from the dreary snows of Valley Forge, and all the hard-fought fields of the war. With all their wounds and all their honors they rise and plead with us for their brethren who survive; and bid us, if indeed we cherish the memory of those who bled in our cause, to show our gratitude, not by sounding words, but by stretching out the strong arm of the country's prosperity to help the veteran survivors gently down to their graves.

But it is time to turn from sentiments on which it is unavailing to dwell. The fiftieth return of this all-important day appears to enjoin on us to reassert the principles of the Declaration of Independence. Have we met, fellow citizens, to commemorate merely the successful termination of a war? Certainly not; the war of 1756 was, in its duration, nearly equal, and signalized in America by the most brilliant achievements of the Provincial arms. But no one would attempt to prevent that war with all its glorious incidents from gradually sinking into the shadows which time throws back on the deeds of men.

Do we celebrate the anniversary of our independence merely because a vast region was severed from an European

empire and established a government for itself? Scarcely even this; the acquisition of Louisiana, a region larger than the old United States,—the almost instantaneous conversion of a vast Spanish colonial waste into free and prosperous members of our republican federation,—the whole effected by a single happy exercise of the treaty-making power,—this is an event, in nature not wholly unlike, in importance not infinitely beneath the separation of the colonies from England, regarded merely as a historical transaction.

But no one thinks of commemorating with festivals the anniversary of this cession; perhaps not ten who hear me recollect the date of the treaty by which it was effected; although it is unquestionably the most important occurrence in our history since the Declaration of Independence, and will render the administration of Mr. Jefferson memorable as long as our republic shall endure.

But it is not merely nor chiefly the military success nor the political event which we commemorate on these patriotic anniversaries. It is to mistake the principle of our celebration to speak of its object either as a trite theme or as one among other important and astonishing incidents of the same kind in the world. The Declaration of the Independence of the United States of America, considered, on the one hand, as the consummation of a long train of measures and counsels—preparatory, even though unconsciously, of this event, and on the other hand, as the foundation of the systems of government which have happily been established in our beloved country, deserves commemoration as the most important event, humanly speaking, in the history of the world; as forming the era from which the establishment of government on a rightful foundation is destined universally to date.

Looking upon the declaration of independence as the one

prominent event which is to represent the American system (and history will so look upon it), I deem it right in itself and seasonable this day to assert, that, while all other political revolutions, reforms, and improvements have been in various ways of the nature of palliatives and alleviations of systems essentially and irremediably vicious, this alone is the great discovery in political science; the Newtonian theory of government toward which the minds of all honest and sagacious statesmen in other times had strained, but without success; the practical fulfilment of all the theories of political perfection which had amused the speculations and eluded the grasp of every former period and people. And although assuredly this festive hour affords but little scope for dry disquisition, and shall not be engrossed by me with abstract speculation, yet I shall not think I wander from the duties of the day in dwelling briefly on the chain of ideas by which we reach this great conclusion.

The political organization of a people is of all matters of temporal concernment the most important. Drawn together into that great assemblage which we call a nation, by the social principle, some mode of organization must exist among men; and on that organization depends more directly, more collectively, more permanently than on anything else the condition of the individual members that make up the community.

On the political organization in which a people shall for generations have been reared it mainly depends whether we shall behold in one of the brethren of the human family the New Hollander making a nauseous meal from the worms which he extracts from a piece of rotten wood; or the African cutting out the under jaw of his captive to be strung on a wire as a trophy of victory, while the mangled wretch is left to

bleed to death on the field of battle; or whether we shall behold him social, civilized, Christian; scarcely faded from that perfect image, in which at the divine purpose, "Let us make man"—

> —"in beauty clad,
> With health in every vein,
> And reason throned upon his brow,
> Stepped forth immortal man."

I am certainly aware that between the individuals that compose a nation, and the nation as an organized body, there are action and reaction; that if political institutions affect the individual, individuals are sometimes gifted with power, and seize on opportunities, most essentially to modify institutions; nor am I at all disposed to agitate the scholastic question which was first in the order of nature or time, men forming governments or governments determining the condition of men.

But having long acted and reacted upon each other, it needs no argument to prove that political institutions get to be infinitely the most important agent in fixing the condition of individuals, and even in determining in what manner and to what extent individual capacity shall be exerted and individual character formed. While other causes do unquestionably operate,—some of them, such as national descent, physical race, climate, and geographical position, very powerfully; yet of none of them is the effect constant, uniform, and prompt; while I believe it is impossible to point out an important change in the political organization of people, a change by which it has been rendered more or less favorable to liberty, without discovering a correspondent effect on their prosperity.

Such is the infinite importance to the nations of men of the political organization which prevails among them. The most

momentous practical question therefore of course is, in what way a people shall determine the political organization under which it will live; or in still broader terms, what is a right foundation of government. Till the establishment of the American constitutions this question had received but one answer in the world; I mean but one which obtained for any length of time and among any numerous people; and that answer was, force.

The right of the strongest was the only footing on which the governments of the ancient and modern nations were in fact placed; and the only effort of the theorists was, to disguise the simple and somewhat startling doctrine of the right of the strongest by various mystical or popular fictions which in no degree altered its real nature. Of these the only two worthy to detain us, on the present occasion, are those of the two great English political parties, the Whigs and the Tories, as they are called, by names not unlike, in dignity and significance, to the doctrines which are designated by them. The Tories taught that the only foundation of government was "divine right;" and this is the same notion which is still inculcated on the continent of Europe; though the delicate ears of the age are flattered by the somewhat milder term, legitimacy.

The Whigs maintained that the foundation of government was an "original contract;" but of this contract the existing organization was the record and the evidence; and the obligation was perpetually binding. It may deserve the passing remark, therefore, that in reality the doctrine of the Whigs in England is a little less liberal than that of the Tories.

To say that the will of God is the warrant by which the king and his hereditary counsellors govern the land is, to be sure, in a practical sense, what the illustrious sage of the revo-

lution, surviving in our neighborhood, dared as early as 1765 to pronounce it, "dark ribaldry." But in a merely speculative sense it may, without offence, be said that government, like everything else, subsists by the divine will; and in this acceptation there is a certain elevation and unction in the sentiment.

But to say that the form of government is matter of original compact with the people; that my ancestors, ages ago, agreed that they and their posterity, to the end of time, should give up to a certain line of princes the rule of the state; that no right remains of revising this compact; that nothing but extreme necessity, a necessity which it is treasonable even to attempt to define beforehand, justifies a departure from this compact in which no provision is made that the will of the majority should be done, but the contrary; a doctrine like this, as it seems to me, while it is in substance as servile as the other, has the disadvantage of affecting a liberality not borne out by the truth.

And now, fellow citizens, I think I speak the words of truth and soberness without color or exaggeration, when I say that before the establishment of our American constitutions this Tory doctrine of the divine right was the most common, and this Whig doctrine of the original contract was professedly the most liberal doctrine ever maintained by any political party in any powerful state.

I do not mean that in some of the little Grecian republics, during their short-lived noon of liberty and glory, nothing better was practised; nor that, in other times and places, speculative politicians had not in their closets dreamed of a better foundation of government. But I do mean, that, whereas the Whigs in England are the party of politicians who have enjoyed, by general consent, the credit of inculcating a

more liberal system, this precious notion of the compact is the extent to which their liberality went.

It is plain, whichever of these solemn phrases —"divine right" or "original compact"—we may prefer to use, that the right of the strongest lies at the foundation of both, in the same way and to the same degree. The doctrine of the divine right gives to the ruler authority to sustain himself against the people, not merely because resistance is unlawful, but because it is sacrilegious. The doctrine of the compact denounces every attempted change in the person of the prince as a breach of faith, and as such also not only treasonable but immoral. When a conflict ensues, force alone, of course, decides which party shall prevail; and when force has so decided, all the sanctions of the divine will and of the social compact revive in favor of the successful party. Even the statute legislation of England, although somewhat coy of unveiling the chaste mysteries of the common law, allows the successful usurper to claim the allegiance of the subject, in as full a manner as it could be done by a lawful sovereign.

Nothing is wanting to fill up this sketch of other governments but to consider what is the form in which force is exercised to sustain them; and this is that of a standing army; at this moment, the chief support of every government on earth, except our own.

As popular violence—the unrestrained and irresistible force of the mass of men, long oppressed and late awakened, and bursting in its wrath all barriers of law and humanity—is unhappily the usual instrument by which the intolerable abuses of a corrupt government are removed; so the same blind force of the same fearful multitude designedly kept in ignorance both of their duty and of their privileges as citizens, employed in a form somewhat different indeed, but far more

dreadful, that of a mercenary standing army, is the instrument by which corrupt governments are sustained.

The deplorable scenes which marked the earlier stages of the French Revolution have called the attention of this age to the fearful effects of popular violence; and the minds of men have recoiled at the dismay which leads the van and the desolation which marks the progress of an infuriated mob. But the power of the mob is transient; the rising sun most commonly scatters its mistrustful ranks; the difficulty of subsistence drives its members asunder; and it is only while it exists in mass that it is terrible.

But there is a form in which the mob is indeed portentous; when to all its native terrors it adds the force of a frightful permanence; when by a regular organization its strength is so curiously divided, and by a strict discipline its parts are so easily combined, that each and every portion of it carries in its presence the strength and terror of the whole; and when, instead of that want of concert which renders the common mob incapable of arduous enterprises, it is despotically swayed by a single master-mind, and may be moved in array across the globe.

I remember to have seen the two kinds of mob brought into direct collision. I was present at the second great meeting of the populace of London in 1819, in the midst of a crowd of I know not how many thousands, but assuredly a vast multitude, which was gathered together in Smithfield Market. The universal distress, as you recollect, was extreme; it was a short time after the scenes at Manchester at which men's minds were ulcerated,—deaths by starvation were said not to be rare; ruin by the stagnation of business was general; and some were already brooding over the dark project of assassinating the ministers, which was not long after matured by

Thistlewood and his associates, some of whom, on the day to which I allude, harangued this excited, desperate, starving assemblage.

When I considered the state of feeling prevailing in the multitude around me, when I looked in their lowering faces, heard their deep, indignant exclamations, reflected on the physical force concentrated, probably, that of thirty or forty thousand able-bodied men; and added to all this, that they were assembled to exercise an undoubted privilege of British citizens; I did suppose that any small number of troops who should attempt to interrupt them would be immolated on the spot.

While I was musing on these things and turning in my mind the commonplaces on the terrors of a mob, a trumpet was heard to sound—an uncertain, but a harsh and clamorous blast. I looked that the surrounding stalls should have furnished the unarmed multitude at least with that weapon with which Virginius sacrificed his daughter to the liberty of Rome; I looked that the flying pavement should begin to darken the air. Another blast is heard—a cry of " The horse-guards! " ran through the assembled thousands; the orators on the platform were struck mute; and the whole of that mighty host of starving, desperate men incontinently took to their heels; in which, I must confess—feeling no vocation in that cause to be faithful found among the faithless—I did myself join them. We had run through the Old Bailey and reached Ludgate Hill before we found out that we had been put to flight by a single mischievous tool of power who had come triumphing down the opposite street on horseback blowing a stage-coachman's horn.

We have heard of those midnight scenes of desolation when the populace of some overgrown capital, exhausted by the

extremity of political oppression, or famishing at the gates of luxurious palaces, or kindled by some transport of fanatical zeal, rushes out to find the victims of its fury; the lurid glare of torches casting their gleams on faces dark with rage; the ominous din of the alarm bell striking with affright on the broken visions of the sleepers; the horrid yells, the thrilling screams, the multitudinous roar of the living storm as it sweeps onward to its objects; but oh, the disciplined, the paid, the honored mob; not moving in rags and starvation to some act of blood or plunder, but marching in all the pomp and circumstance of war to lay waste a feebler state, or cantoned at home among an overawed and broken-spirited people! I have read of granaries plundered, of castles sacked, and their inmates cruelly murdered by the ruthless hands of the mob. I have read of friendly states ravaged, governments overturned, tyrannies founded and upheld, proscriptions executed, fruitful regions turned into trampled deserts, the tide of civilization thrown back, and a line of generations cursed by a well-organized system of military force.

Such was the foundation in theory and in practice of all the governments which can be considered as having had a permanent existence in the world before the revolution in this country. There are certainly shades of difference between the oriental despotisms, ancient and modern—the military empire of Rome, the feudal sovereignties of the Middle Ages—and the legitimate monarchies of the present day. Some were and are more, and some less, susceptible of melioration in practice; and of all of them it might perhaps be said—being all in essence bad—

"That which is best administered is best."

In no one of these governments, nor in any government, was

the truth admitted, that the only just foundation of all government is the will of the people. If it ever occurred to the practical or theoretical politician that such an idea deserved examination, the experiment was thought to have been made in the republics of Greece, and to have failed, as fail it certainly did, from the physical impossibility of conducting the business of the state by the actual intervention of every citizen.

Such a plan of government must of course fail, if for no other reason, at least for this, that it would prevent the citizen from pursuing his own business, which it is the object of all government to enable him to do. It was considered then as settled, that the citizens, each and all, could not be the government; some one or more must discharge its duties for them. Who shall do this; how shall they be designated?

The first king was a fortunate soldier and the first nobleman was one of his generals; and government has passed by descent to their posterity with no other interruption than has taken place when some new soldier of fortune has broken in upon this line of succession in favor of himself and of his generals. The people have passed for nothing in the plan; and whenever it has occurred to a busy genius to put the question—by what right government is thus exercised and transmitted? the common answer has been—by divine right; while, in times of rare illumination, men have been consoled with the assurance that such was the original contract.

But a brighter day and a better dispensation were in reserve. The founders of the feudal system, barbarous, arbitrary, and despotic as they were, and profoundly ignorant of political science, were animated themselves with a spirit of personal liberty, out of which, after ages of conflict, grew up a species of popular representation.

In the eye of the feudal system the king was the first baron, and, standing within his own sphere, each other baron was as good as the first. From this important relation in which the feudal lords of England claimed to stand to their prince arose the practice of their being consulted by him in great and difficult conjunctures of affairs; and hence the co-operation of a grand council (subsequently convened in two houses under the name of Parliament) in making the laws and administering the government. The formation of this body has proved a great step in the progress of popular rights; its influence has been decisive in breaking the charm of absolute monarchy and giving to a body, partially eligible by the people, a share in the government.

It has also operated most auspiciously on liberty, by exhibiting to the world on the theatre of a conspicuous nation a living example that in proportion as the rights and interests of a people are represented in a government, in that degree the state becomes strong and prosperous. Thus far the science and the practice of government had gone in England, and here it had come to a stand.

An equal representation, even in the House of Commons, was unthought of; or thought of only as one of the exploded abominations of Cromwell. It is asserted by Mr. Hume, writing about the middle of the last century, and weighing this subject with equal moderation and sagacity, that "the tide has run long and with some rapidity to the side of popular government, and is just beginning to turn toward monarchy." And he maintains that the British constitution is, though slowly, yet gradually verging toward an absolute government.

Such was the state of political science when the independence of our country was declared, and its constitutions or-

ganized on the basis of that declaration. The precedents in favor of a popular system were substantially these, the short-lived prosperity of the republics of Greece where each citizen took part in the conduct of affairs; and the admission into the British government of one branch of the legislature nominally elective, and operating rather by opinion than power, as a partial check on the other branches.

What lights these precedents gave them our fathers had; beyond this they owed everything to their own wisdom and courage in daring to carry out and apply to the executive branch of the government that system of delegated power, of which the elements existed in their own provincial assemblies. They assumed at once, not as a matter to be reached by argumentation, but as the dictate of unaided reason—as an axiom too obvious to be discussed though never in practice applied—that where the state is too large to be governed by an actual assembly of all the citizens the people shall elect those who will act for them in making the laws and administering the government.

They therefore laid the basis of their constitutions in a proportionate delegation of power from every part of the community; and regarding the declaration of our independence as the true era of our institutions, we are authorized to assert that from that era dates the establishment of the only perfect organization of government, that of a representative republic, administered by persons freely chosen by the people.

This plan of government is therefore, in its theory, perfect; and in its operation it is perfect also; that is to say, no measure of policy, public or private, domestic or foreign, can long be pursued against the will of a majority of the people. Farther than this the wisdom of government cannot go. The majority of the people may err. Man collectively as well as

individually is man still; but whom can you more safely trust than the majority of the people; who is so likely to be right, always right, and altogether right, as the collective majority of a great nation represented in all its interests and pursuits and in all its communities?

Thus has been solved the great problem in human affairs; and a frame of government, perfect in its principles, has been brought down from the airy regions of Utopia and has found "a local habitation and a name" in our country. Henceforward we have only to strive that the practical operation of our systems may be true to their spirit and theory. Henceforth it may be said of us, what never could have been said of any people since the world began,—be our sufferings what they will, no one can attribute them to our frame of government; no one can point out a principle in our political systems of which he has had reason to complain; no one can sigh for a change in his country's institutions as a boon to be desired for himself or for his children. There is not an apparent defect in our constitutions which could be removed without introducing a greater one; nor a real evil whose removal would not be rather a nearer approach to the principles on which they are founded, than a departure from them.

And what, fellow citizens, are to be the fruits to us and to the world of the establishment of this perfect system of government? I might partly answer the inquiry by reminding you what have been the fruits to us and to the world; by inviting you to compare our beloved country, as it is, in extent of settlement, in numbers and resources, in the useful and ornamental arts, in the abundance of the common blessings of life, in the general standard of character, in the means of education, in the institutions for social objects, in the various great industrial interests, in public strength and national

respectability, with what it was in all these respects fifty years ago. But the limits of this occasion will not allow us to engage in such an enumeration; and it will be amply sufficient for us to contemplate in its principle the beneficial operation on society of the form of government bequeathed to us by our fathers. This principle is equality; the equal enjoyment by every citizen of the rights and privileges of the social union.

The principle of all other governments is monopoly, exclusion, favor. They secure great privileges to a small number and necessarily at the expense of all the rest of the citizens.

In the keen conflict of minds which preceded and accompanied the political convulsions of the last generation the first principles of society were canvassed with a boldness and power before unknown in Europe, and from the great principle that all men are equal it was for the first time triumphantly inferred, as a necessary consequence, that the will of a majority of the people is the rule of government. To meet these doctrines, so appalling in their tendency to the existing institutions of Europe, new ground was also taken by the champions of those institutions, and particularly by a man whose genius, eloquence, and integrity gave a currency which nothing else could have given, to his splendid paradoxes and servile doctrines.

In one of his renowned productions[1] this great man,—for great, even in his errors, most assuredly he was,—in order to meet the inferences drawn from the equality of man, that the will of the majority must be the rule of government, has undertaken, as he says, "to fix with some degree of distinctness an idea of what it is we mean when we say 'The

[1] The appeal from the New to the Old Whigs.

People;'" and in fulfilment of this design he lays it down "that in a state of rude nature there is no such thing as a people.

"A number of men in themselves can have no collective capacity. The idea of a people is the idea of a corporation, it is wholly artificial, and made, like all other legal fictions, by common agreement."

"In a state of rude nature there is no such thing as a people!" I would fain learn in what corner of the earth, rude or civilized, men are to be found who are not a people more or less improved. "A number of men in themselves have no collective capacity!" I would gladly be told where, in what region,—I will not say of geography, I know there is none such,—but of poetry or romance, a number of men has been placed, by nature, each standing alone and not bound by any of those ties of blood, affinity, and language which form the rudiments of a collective capacity. "The idea of a people is the idea of a corporation, it is wholly artificial, and made, like all other legal fictions, by common agreement."

Indeed, is the social principle artificial? Is the gift of articulate speech which enables man to impart his condition to man, the organized sense which enables him to comprehend what is imparted—is that sympathy which subjects our opinions and feelings, and through them our conduct, to the influence of others and their conduct to our influence—is that chain of cause and effect, which makes our characters receive impressions from the generations before us, and puts it in our power, by a good or bad precedent, to distill a poison or a balm into the characters of posterity—are these, indeed, all by-laws of a corporation?

Are all the feelings of ancestry, posterity, and fellow citizenship; all the charm, veneration, and love bound up in the

name of country; the delight, the enthusiasm, with which we seek out, after the lapse of generations and ages, the traces of our fathers' bravery or wisdom, are these all "a legal fiction?"

Is it indeed a legal fiction that moistens the eye of the solitary traveller when he meets a countryman in a foreign land? Is it a "common agreement" that gives its meaning to my mother tongue and enables me to speak to the hearts of my kindred men beyond the rivers and beyond the mountains? Yes, it is a common agreement; recorded on the same registry with that which marshals the winged nations that,

> "In common, ranged in figure, wedge their way,
> Intelligent of seasons; and set forth
> Their airy caravan, high over seas
> Flying, and over lands, with mutual wing
> Easing their flight."

The mutual dependence of man on man, family on family, interest on interest, is but a chapter in the great law, not of corporations, but of nature. The law, by which commerce, manufactures, and agriculture support each other, is the same law in virtue of which the thirsty earth owes its fertility to the rivers and the rains; and the clouds derive their high travelling waters from the rising vapors; and the ocean is fed from the secret springs of the mountains; and the plant that grows derives its increase from the plant that decays; and all subsist and thrive, not by themselves but by others, in the great political economy of nature.

The necessary cohesion of the parts of the political system is no more artificial than the gravity of the natural system, in which planet is bound to planet, and all to the sun and the sun to all. Insulate an interest in society, a family, or a man, and all the faculties and powers they possess will avail them little toward the great objects of life; in like manner, as not all the

mysteriously combined elements of the earth around and beneath us, the light and volatile airs, that fill the atmosphere; not the electric fluid, which lies condensed and embattled in its cloudy magazines, or subtilely diffused through creation; not the volcanic fires that rage in the earth's bosom, nor all her mines of coal and nitre and sulphur; nor fountains of naphtha, petroleum, or asphaltus,—not all, combined and united afford one beam of that common light which sends man forth from his labors, and which is the sun's contribution to the system in which we live.

And yet the great natural system, the political, intellectual, moral system, is artificial, as a legal fiction! "O that mine enemy had said it," the admirers of Mr. Burke may well exclaim. Oh that some impious Voltaire, some ruthless Rousseau had uttered it. Had uttered it! Rousseau did utter the same thing; and more rebuked than any other error of this misguided genius is his doctrine of the Social Contract, of which Burke has reasserted, and more than reasserted, the principle in the sentences I have quoted.

But no, fellow citizens; political society exists by the law of nature. Man is formed for it; every man is formed for it; every man has an equal right to its privileges, and to be deprived of them, under whatever pretence, is so far to be reduced to slavery. The authors of the Declaration of Independence saw this and taught that all men are born free and equal. On this principle our constitutions rest; and no constitution can bind a people on any other principle.

No original contract that gives away this right can bind any but the parties to it. My forefathers could not, if they had wished, have stipulated to their king that his children should rule over their children. By the introduction of this principle of equality it is that the Declaration of Independence has at

once effected a before unimagined extension of social privileges.

Grant that no new blessing (which, however, can by no means with truth be granted) be introduced into the world on this plan of equality, still it will have discharged the inestimable office of communicating, in equal proportion, to all the citizens, those privileges of the social union which were before partitioned in an invidious gradation, profusely among the privileged orders, and parsimoniously among all the rest.

Let me instance in the right of suffrage. The enjoyment of this right enters largely into the happiness of the social condition. I do not mean that it is necessary to our happiness actually to exercise this right at every election; but I say the right itself to give our voice in the choice of public servants and the management of public affairs is so precious, so inestimable, that there is not a citizen who hears me that would not lay down his life to assert it. This is a right unknown in every country but ours; I say unknown, because in England, whose institutions make the nearest approach to a popular character, the elective suffrage is not only incredibly unequal and capricious in its distribution; but extends, after all, only to the choice of a minority of one house of the legislature. Thus, then, the people of this country are, by their constitutions of government, endowed with a new source of enjoyment, elsewhere almost unknown; a great and substantial happiness; an unalloyed happiness.

Most of the desirable things of life bear a high price in the world's market. Everything usually deemed a great good must, for its attainment, be weighed down in the opposite scale, with what is as usually deemed a great evil—labor, care, danger. It is only the unbought, spontaneous, essential circumstances of our nature and condition that yield a liberal

enjoyment. Our religious hopes, intellectual meditations, social sentiments, family affections, political privileges, these are springs of unpurchased happiness; and to condemn men to live under an arbitrary government is to cut them off from nearly all the satisfactions which nature designed should flow from those principles within us by which a tribe of kindred men is constituted a people.

But it is not merely an extension to all the members of society of those blessings which, under other systems, are monopolized by a few; great and positive improvements, I feel sure, are destined to flow from the introduction of the republican system. The first of these will be to make wars less frequent, and finally to cause them to cease altogether. It was not a republican, it was the subject of a monarchy, and no patron of novelties, who said,

> "War is a game which, were their subjects wise,
> Kings would not play at."

A great majority of the wars which have desolated mankind have grown either out of the disputed titles and rival claims of sovereigns or their personal character, particularly their ambition, or the character of their favorites, or some other circumstance evidently incident to a form of government which withholds from the people the ultimate control of affairs. And the more civilized men grow, strange as it may seem, the more universally is this the case.

In the barbarous ages the people pursued war as an occupation; its plunder was more profitable than their labor at home in the state of general insecurity. In modern times princes raise their soldiers by conscription, their sailors by impressment, and drive them at the point of the bayonet and dirk into the battles they fight for reasons of state.

But in a republic, where the people by their representatives

must vote the declaration of war, and afterward raise the means of its support, none but wars of just and necessary defence can be waged. Republics, we are told, indeed, are ambitious,—a seemingly wise remark, devoid of meaning. Man is ambitious; and the question is, where will his ambition be most likely to drive his country into war; in a monarchy, where he has but to "Cry havoc, and let slip the dogs of war," or in a republic, where he must get the vote of a strong majority of the nation?

Let history furnish the answer. The book which promised you in its title a picture of the progress of the human family turns out to be a record, not of the human family, but of the Macedonian family, the Julian family, the families of York and Lancaster, of Lorraine and Bourbon. We need not go to the ancient annals to confirm this remark. We need not speak of those who reduced Asia and Africa in the morning of the world to a vassalage from which they have never recovered.

We need not dwell on the more notorious exploits of the Alexanders and the Cæsars, the men who wept for other worlds to visit with the pestilence of their arms. We need not run down the bloody line of the dark ages when the barbarous North disgorged her ambitious savages on Europe, or when at a later period barbarous Europe poured back her holy ruffians on Asia; we need but look at the dates of modern history,—the history of civilized, balanced Europe. We here behold the ambition of Charles V involving the continent of Europe in war for the first half of the sixteenth century, and the fiend-like malignity of Catherine de Medici and her kindred distracting it the other half. We see the haughty and cheerless bigotry of Philip persevering in a conflict of extermination for one whole age in the Netherlands and darkening the English Channel with his armada; while France prolongs her civil dis-

sensions because Henry IV was the twenty-second cousin of Henry III.

We enter the seventeenth century and again find the hereditary pride and bigotry of the House of Austria wasting Germany and the neighboring powers with the Thirty Years' war; and before the peace of Westphalia is concluded England is plunged into the fiery trial of her militant liberties. Contemporaneously, the civil wars are revived in France, and the kingdom is blighted by the passions of Mazarin.

The civil wars are healed and the atrocious career of Louis XIV begins; a half century of bloodshed and woe, that stands in revolting contrast with the paltry pretences of his wars. At length the peace of Ryswick is made in 1697 and bleeding Europe throws off the harness and lies down like an exhausted giant to repose. In three years the testament of a doting Spanish king gives the signal for the Succession War; till a cup of tea spilt on Mrs. Masham's apron restores peace to the afflicted kingdoms. Meantime the madman of the North had broken loose upon the world and was running his frantic round. Peace at length is restored and with one or two short wars it remains unbroken till, in 1740, the will of Charles VI occasions another testamentary contest; and in the gallant words of the stern but relenting moralist,

"The queen, the beauty, sets the world in arms."

Eight years are this time sufficient to exhaust the combatants, and the peace of Aix-la-Chapelle is concluded; but in 1755 the old French war is kindled in our own wilderness and through the united operation of the monopolizing spirit of England, the party intrigues of France, and the ambition of Frederick, spread throughout Europe.

The wars of the last generation I need not name, nor dwell

on that signal retribution by which the political ambition of the cabinets at length conjured up the military ambition of the astonishing individual who seems in our day to have risen out of the ranks of the people to chastise the privileged orders with that iron scourge with which they had so long afflicted mankind; to gather with his strong plebeian hands the fragrance of those palmy honors which they had reared for three centuries in the bloody gardens of their royalty.

It may well be doubted whether, under a government like ours, one of all these contests would have taken place. Those that arose from disputed titles and bequests of thrones could not of course have existed; and making every allowance for the effect of popular delusion it seems to me not possible that a representative government would have embarked in any of the wars of ambition and aggrandizement which fill up the catalogue.

Who then are these families and individuals—these royal *lanistæ*—by whom the nations are kept in training for a long gladiatorial combat? Are they better, wiser than we? Look at them in life; what are they? "Kings are fond," says Mr. Burke, no scoffer at thrones, "kings are fond of low company." What are they when gone? *Expende Hannibalem.* Enter the great cathedrals of Europe and contemplate the sepulchres of the men who claimed to be the lords of each successive generation. Question your own feelings as you behold where the Plantagenets and Tudors, the Stuarts and those of Brunswick, lie mournfully huddled up in the chapels of Westminster Abbey; and compare those feelings with the homage you pay to heaven's aristocracy,—the untitled learning, genius, and wit that molder by their side. Count over the sixty-six emperors and princes of the Austrian house that lie gathered in the dreary pomp of monumental marble in the vaults of the

Capuchins at Vienna; and weigh the worth of their dust against the calamities of their Peasants' war, their Thirty Years' war, their Succession war, their wars to enforce the Pragmatic Sanction, and of all the other uncouth pretences for destroying mankind with which they have plagued the world.

But the cessation of wars to which we look forward as the result of the gradual diffusion of republican government is but the commencement of the social improvements which cannot but flow from the same benignant source. It has been justly said that he was a great benefactor of mankind who could make two blades of grass grow where one grew before. But our fathers—our fathers were the benefactors of mankind—who brought into action such a vast increase of physical, political, and moral energy; who have made not two citizens to live only, but hundreds, yea, unnumbered thousands to live and to prosper in regions which but for their achievements would have remained for ages unsettled, and to enjoy those rights of men which but for their institutions would have continued to be arrogated as the exclusive inheritance of a few.

I appeal to the fact. I ask any sober judge of political probability to tell me whether more has not been done to extend the domain of civilization in fifty years since the declaration of independence than would have been done in five centuries of continued colonial subjection. It is not even a matter of probability; the king in council had adopted it as a maxim of his American policy that no settlements in this country should be made beyond the Alleghanies; that the design of Providence in spreading out the fertile valley of the Mississippi should not be fulfilled.

I know that it is said, in palliation of the restrictive influ-

ence of European governments, that they are as good as their subjects can bear. I know it is said that it would be useless and pernicious to call on the half-savage and brutified peasantry of many countries to take a share in the administration of affairs by electing or being elected to office. I know they are unfit for it; it is the very curse of the system. What is it that unfits them? What is it that makes slavish labor, and slavish ignorance, and slavish stupidity their necessary heritage? Are they not made of the same Caucasian clay? Have they not five senses, the same faculties, the same passions? And is it anything but an aggravation of the vice of arbitrary governments that they first deprive men of their rights and then unfit them to exercise those rights; profanely construing the effect into a justification of the evil?

The influence of our institutions on foreign nations is—next to their effect on our own condition—the most interesting question we can contemplate. With our example of popular government before their eyes the nations of the earth will not eventually be satisfied with any other. With the French Revolution as a beacon to guide them they will learn, we may hope, not to embark too rashly on the mounting waves of reform.

The cause, however, of popular government is rapidly gaining in the world. In England education is carrying it wide and deep into society. On the Continent written constitutions of governments, nominally representative,—though as yet, it must be owned, nominally so alone,—are adopted in eight or ten late absolute monarchies; and it is not without good grounds that we may trust that the indifference with which the Christian powers contemplate the sacrifice of Greece and their crusade against the constitutions of Spain, Piedmont, and Naples will satisfy the mass of thinking men in

Europe that it is time to put an end to these cruel delusions and take their own government into their own hands.

But the great triumphs of constitutional freedom to which our independence has furnished the example have been witnessed in the southern portion of our hemisphere. Sunk to the last point of colonial degradation they have risen at once into the organization of free republics. Their struggle has been arduous; and eighteen years of chequered fortune have not yet brought it to a close. But we must not infer from their prolonged agitation that their independence is uncertain; that they have prematurely put on the *toga virilis* of freedom. They have not begun too soon; they have more to do.

Our war of independence was shorter; happily we were contending with a government that could not, like that of Spain, pursue an interminable and hopeless contest in defiance of the people's will. Our transition to a mature and well-adjusted constitution was more prompt than that of our sister republics; for the foundations had long been settled, the preparation long made. And when we consider that it is our example which has aroused the spirit of independence from California to Cape Horn; that the experiment of liberty, if it had failed with us, most surely would not have been attempted by them; that even now our councils and acts will operate as powerful precedents in this great family of republics, we learn the importance of the post which Providence has assigned us in the world.

A wise and harmonious administration of the public affairs, a faithful, liberal, and patriotic exercise of the private duties of the citizen, while they secure our happiness at home, will diffuse a healthful influence through the channels of national communication and serve the cause of liberty beyond the equator and the Andes. When we show an united, concilia-

tory, and imposing front to their rising states we show them, better than sounding eulogies can do, the true aspect of an independent republic. We give them a living example that the fireside policy of a people is like that of the individual man. As the one, commencing in the prudence, order, and industry of the private circle, extends itself to all the duties of social life, of the family, the neighborhood, the country; so the true domestic policy of the republic, beginning in the wise organization of its own institutions, pervades its territories with a vigilant, prudent, temperate administration; and extends the hand of cordial interest to all the friendly nations, especially to those which are of the household of liberty.

It is in this way that we are to fulfil our destiny in the world. The greatest engine of moral power which human nature knows is an organized, prosperous state. All that man in his individual capacity can do, all that he can effect by his fraternities, by his ingenious discoveries and wonders of art, or by his influence over others, is as nothing compared with the collective, perpetuated influence on human affairs and human happiness of a well-constituted, powerful commonwealth.

It blesses generations with its sweet influence; even the barren earth seems to pour out its fruits under a system where property is secure, while her fairest gardens are blighted by despotism; men—thinking, reasoning men—abound beneath its benignant sway; nature enters into a beautiful accord, a better, purer *asiento* with man, and guides an industrious citizen to every rood of her smiling wastes; and we see at length that what has been called a state of nature has been most falsely, calumniously so denominated; that the nature of man is neither that of a savage, a hermit, nor a slave, but that of a member of a well-ordered family, that of a good neighbor,

a free citizen, a well-informed, good man, acting with others like him. This is the lesson which is taught in the charter of our independence; this is the lesson which our example is to teach the world.

The epic poet of Rome—the faithful subject of an absolute prince—in unfolding the duties and destinies of his countrymen, bids them look down with disdain on the polished and intellectual arts of Greece, and deem their arts to be

> "To rule the nations with imperial sway;
> To spare the tribes that yield; fight down the proud;
> And force the mood of peace upon the world."

A nobler counsel breathes from the charter of our independence; a happier province belongs to our free republic. Peace we would extend, but by persuasion and example—the moral force, by which alone it can prevail among the nations. Wars we may encounter, but it is in the sacred character of the injured and the wronged; to raise the trampled rights of humanity from the dust; to rescue the mild form of liberty from her abode among the prisons and the scaffolds of the elder world, and to seat her in the chair of state among her adoring children; to give her beauty for ashes; a healthful action for her cruel agony; to put at last a period to her warfare on earth; to tear her star-spangled banner from the perilous ridges of battle and plant it on the rock of ages. There be it fixed forever,—the power of a free people slumbering in its folds, their peace reposing in its shade!

CORWIN

THOMAS CORWIN, an American orator, was born in Bourbon County, Kentucky, July 29, 1794, but removed with his parents to Ohio in 1798, where his youth was passed on his father's farm. His opportunities were limited, but at twenty-one he began the study of law and in 1818 was admitted to the bar. Four years later he entered the Ohio legislature, making in his first session a speech in opposition to the proposed introduction of the whipping-post into Ohio. After seven years' continuous service in the legislature he entered Congress as a representative and was prominent there as a Whig leader. He resigned in 1840 to become a candidate for the governorship of Ohio. During this political campaign Corwin spoke several times a day for over three months. He was elected by a large majority, but was defeated in a similar contest in 1842. In 1844 he was elected to the United States Senate, where he was conspicuous as one of the strongest opponents of the war with Mexico. During the administration of President Fillmore, 1850-53, Corwin was secretary of the treasury, and on the expiration of Fillmore's term he returned to the practice of his profession at Lebanon, Ohio. From 1858 to 1861 he sat in Congress as representative, and was subsequently minister to Mexico, 1861-64. He died at Washington city, December 18, 1865. Corwin was a brilliant speaker, both in the court room and in Congress, and his social qualities made him a general favorite, although his bitter opposition to the Mexican War no doubt hindered his political advancement to some extent. His "Life and Speeches," appeared in 1859 and 1896.

FROM SPEECH ON THE MEXICAN WAR

DELIVERED IN THE UNITED STATES SENATE, FEBRUARY 11, 1847

THE President has said he does not expect to hold Mexican territory by conquest. Why then conquer it? Why waste thousands of lives and millions of money fortifying towns and creating governments, if, at the end of the war, you retire from the graves of your soldiers and the desolated country of your foes, only to get money from Mexico for the expense of all your toil and sacrifice? Who ever heard, since Christianity was propagated among men, of a nation taxing its people, enlisting its young men, and marching off two thousand miles to fight a people merely to

be paid for it in money? What is this but hunting a market for blood, selling the lives of your young men, marching them in regiments to be slaughtered and paid for like oxen and brute beasts?

Sir, this is, when stripped naked, that atrocious idea first promulgated in the President's message, and now advocated here, of fighting on till we can get our indemnity for the past as well as the present slaughter. We have chastised Mexico, and if it were worth while to do so, we have, I dare say, satisfied the world that we can fight. What now? Why the mothers of America are asked to send another of their sons to blow out the brains of Mexicans because they refuse to pay the price of the first who fell there fighting for glory! And what if the second fall, too? The Executive, the parental reply is, "We shall have him paid for; we shall get full indemnity!"

Sir, I have no patience with this flagitious notion of fighting for indemnity, and this under the equally absurd and hypocritical pretence of securing an honorable peace. An honorable peace! If you have accomplished the objects of the war—if indeed you had an object which you dare to avow—cease to fight and you will have peace. Conquer your insane love of false glory, and you will "conquer a peace."

Sir, if your commander-in-chief will not do this, I will endeavor to compel him, and as I find no other means I shall refuse supplies—without the money of the people he cannot go further. He asks me for that money; I wish him to bring your armies home, to cease shedding blood for money; if he refuses, I will refuse supplies, and then I know he must, he will cease his further sale of the lives of my countrymen.

May we not, ought we not now to do this? I can hear no reason why we should not, except this: It is said that we

are in war, wrongfully it may be, but, being in, the President is responsible, and we must give him the means he requires! He responsible! Sir, we, we are responsible, if, having the power to stay this plague, we refuse to do so. When it shall be so—when the American Senate and the American House of Representatives can stoop from their high position and yield a dumb compliance with the behests of a president who is, for the time being, commander of your army; when they will open the treasury with one hand, and the veins of all the soldiers in the land with the other, merely because the President commands, then, sir, it matters little how soon some Cromwell shall come into this hall and say, "The Lord hath no further need of you here."

When we fail to do the work "whereunto we were sent," we shall be, we ought to be, removed, and give place to others who will. The fate of the barren fig-tree will be ours —Christ cursed it and it withered.

Mr. President, I dismiss this branch of the subject, and beg the indulgence of the Senate to some reflections on the particular bill now under consideration. I voted for a bill somewhat like the present at the last session—our army was then in the neighborhood of our line. I then hoped that the President did sincerely desire a peace. Our army had not then penetrated far into Mexico and I did hope that with the two millions then proposed we might get peace and avoid the slaughter, the shame, the crime, of an aggressive, unprovoked war. But now you have overrun half of Mexico, you have exasperated and irritated her people, you claim indemnity for all expenses incurred in doing this mischief and boldly ask her to give up New Mexico and California; and, as a bribe to her patriotism, seizing on her property, you offer three millions to pay the soldiers she has called out to repel your

invasion on condition that she will give up to you at least one third of her whole territory. This is the modest—I should say, the monstrous—proposition now before us as explained by the chairman of the committee on foreign relations [Mr. Sevier], who reported the bill. I cannot now give my consent to this.

But, sir, I do not believe you will succeed. I am not informed of your prospects of success with this measure of peace. The chairman of the committee on foreign relations tells us that he has every reason to believe that peace can be obtained if we grant this appropriation. What reason have you, Mr. Chairman, for that opinion? "Facts which I cannot disclose to you—correspondence which it would be improper to name here—facts which I know, but which you are not permitted to know, have satisfied the committee that peace may be purchased if you will but grant these three millions of dollars."

Now, Mr. President, I wish to know if I am required to act upon such opinions of the chairman of the committee on foreign relations, formed upon facts which he refuses to disclose to me? No! I must know the facts before I can form my judgment. But I am to take it for granted that there must be some prospect of an end to this dreadful war—for it is a dreadful war, being, as I believe in my conscience it is, an unjust war. Is it possible that for three millions you can purchase a peace with Mexico? How? By the purchase of California? Mr. President, I know not what facts the chairman of the committee on foreign affairs may have had access to. I know not what secret agents have been whispering into the ears of the authorities of Mexico; but of one thing I am certain, that by a cession of California and New Mexico you never can purchase a peace with her.

You may wrest provinces from Mexico by war—you may hold them by the right of the strongest—you may rob her; but a treaty of peace to that effect with the people of Mexico, legitimately and freely made, you never will have! I thank God that it is so, as well for the sake of the Mexican people as ourselves; for, unlike the senator from Alabama [Mr. Bagby], I do not value the life of a citizen of the United States above the lives of a hundred thousand Mexican women and children—a rather cold sort of philanthropy, in my judgment. For the sake of Mexico, then, as well as our own country, I rejoice that it is an impossibility that you can obtain by treaty from her those territories under the existing state of things.

I am somewhat at a loss to know on what plan of operations gentlemen having charge of this war intend to proceed. We hear much said of the terror of your arms. The affrighted Mexican, it is said, when you shall have drenched his country in blood, will sue for peace, and thus you will indeed "conquer peace." This is the heroic and savage tone in which we have heretofore been lectured by our friends on the other side of the chamber, especially by the senator from Michigan [General Cass].

But suddenly the chairman of the committee on foreign relations comes to us with a smooth phrase of diplomacy made potent by the gentle suasion of gold. The chairman of the committee on military affairs calls for thirty millions of money and ten thousand regular troops; these, we are assured, shall "conquer peace," if the obstinate Celt refuses to treat till we shall whip him in another field of blood. What a delightful scene in the nineteenth century of the Christian era!

What an interesting sight to see these two representatives

of war and peace moving in grand procession through the halls of the Montezumas! The senator from Michigan [General Cass], red with the blood of recent slaughter, the gory spear of Achilles in his hand and the hoarse clarion of war in his mouth, blowing a blast "so loud and deep" that the sleeping echoes of the lofty Cordilleras start from their caverns and return the sound, till every ear from Panama to Santa Fé is deafened with the roar. By his side, with "modest mien and downcast look," comes the senator from Arkansas [Mr. Sevier], covered from head to foot with a gorgeous robe, glittering and embossed with three millions of shining gold, putting to shame "the wealth of Ormus or of Ind." The olive of Minerva graces his brow; in his right hand is the delicate rebec, from which are breathed, in Lydian measure, notes "that tell of naught but love and peace."

I fear very much you will scarcely be able to explain to the simple, savage mind of the half-civilized Mexicans the puzzling dualism of this scene, at once gorgeous and grotesque. Sir, I scarcely understand the meaning of all this myself. If we are to vindicate our rights by battles—in bloody fields of war—let us do it. If that is not the plan, why then let us call back our armies into our own territory, and propose a treaty with Mexico based upon the proposition that money is better for her and land is better for us. Thus we can treat Mexico like an equal and do honor to ourselves.

But what is it you ask? You have taken from Mexico one fourth of her territory, and you now propose to run a line comprehending about another third, and for what? I ask, Mr. President, for what? What has Mexico got from you for parting with two thirds of her domain? She has given you ample redress for every injury of which you have com-

plained. She has submitted to the award of your commissioners, and up to the time of the rupture with Texas faithfully paid it. And for all that she has lost (not through or by you, but which loss has been your gain), what requital do we, her strong, rich, robust neighbor, make? Do we send our missionaries there "to point the way to heaven?" Or do we send the schoolmasters to pour daylight into her dark places, to aid her infant strength to conquer freedom and reap the fruit of the independence herself alone had won?

No, no, none of this do we! But we send regiments, storm towns, and our colonels prate of liberty in the midst of the solitudes their ravages have made. They proclaim the empty forms of social compact to a people bleeding and maimed with wounds received in defending their hearthstones against the invasion of these very men who shoot them down and then exhort them to be free. Your chaplains of the navy throw aside the New Testament and seize a bill of rights. The Rev. Don Walter Colton, I see, abandons the Sermon on the Mount, and betakes himself to Blackstone and Kent, and is elected a justice of the peace! He takes military possession of some town in California, and instead of teaching the plan of the atonement and the way of salvation to the poor, ignorant Celt, he presents Colt's pistol to his ear, and calls on him to take "trial by jury and habeas corpus," or nine bullets in his head. Oh! Mr. President, are you not the lights of the earth, if not its salt? You, you are indeed opening the eyes of the blind in Mexico, with a most emphatic and exoteric power. Sir, if all this were not a sad, mournful truth, it would be the very *ne plus ultra* of the ridiculous.

But, sir, let us see what, as the chairman of the committee on foreign relations explains it, we are to get by the combined processes of conquest and treaty.

What is the territory, Mr. President, which you propose to wrest from Mexico? It is consecrated to the heart of the Mexican by many a well-fought battle with his old Castilian master. His Bunker Hills, and Saratogas, and Yorktowns are there. The Mexican can say, "There I bled for liberty! and shall I surrender that consecrated home of my affections to the Anglo-Saxon invaders? What do they want with it? They have Texas already. They have possessed themselves of the territory between the Nueces and the Rio Grande. What else do they want? To what shall I point my children as memorials of that independence which I bequeath to them when those battlefields shall have passed from my possession?"

Sir, had one come and demanded Bunker Hill of the people of Massachusetts, had England's lion ever showed himself there, is there a man over thirteen and under ninety who would not have been ready to meet him; is there a river on this continent that would not have run red with blood; is there a field but would have been piled high with the unburied bones of slaughtered Americans before these consecrated battlefields of liberty should have been wrested from us? But this same American goes into a sister republic and says to poor, weak Mexico, "Give up your territory—you are unworthy to possess it—I have got one half already—all I ask of you is to give up the other!"

England might as well, in the circumstances I have described, have come and demanded of us, "Give up the Atlantic slope—give up this trifling territory from the Allegheny mountains to the sea; it is only from Maine to St. Mary's—only about one third of your republic, and the least interesting portion of it." What would be the response? They would say we must give this up to John Bull. Why? "He wants room." The senator from Michigan says he must have this.

Why, my worthy Christian brother, on what principle of justice? "I want room!"

Sir, look at this pretence of want of room! With twenty millions of people you have about one thousand millions of acres of land, inviting settlement by every conceivable argument—bringing them down to a quarter of a dollar an acre, and allowing every man to squat where he pleases. But the senator from Michigan says we will be two hundred millions in a few years, and we want room. If I were a Mexican I would tell you, "Have you not room in your own country to bury your dead men? If you come into mine we will greet you with bloody hands and welcome you to hospitable graves."

Why, says the chairman of this committee on foreign relations, it is the most reasonable thing in the world! We ought to have the Bay of San Francisco. Why? Because it is the best harbor on the Pacific! It has been my fortune, Mr. President, to have practised a good deal in criminal courts in the course of my life, but I never yet heard a thief arraigned for stealing a horse plead that it was the best horse that he could find in the country! We want California. What for? Why, says the senator from Michigan, we will have it; and the senator from South Carolina, with a very mistaken view, I think, of policy, says you can't keep our people from going there. Let them go and seek their happiness in whatever country or clime it pleases them.

All I ask of them is, not to require this government to protect them with that banner consecrated to war waged for principles—eternal, enduring truth. Sir, it is not meet that our old flag should throw its protecting folds over expeditions for lucre or for land. But you still say you want room for your people. This has been the plea of every robber-chief from Nimrod to the present hour. I dare say, when Tamerlane

descended from his throne built of seventy thousand human skulls, and marched his ferocious battalions to further slaughter, I dare say he said, "I want room."

Bajazet was another gentleman of kindred tastes and wants with us Anglo-Saxons—he "wanted room." Alexander, too, the mighty "Macedonian madman," when he wandered with his Greeks to the plains of India and fought a bloody battle on the very ground where recently England and the Sikhs engaged in strife for "room," was no doubt in quest of some California there. Many a Monterey had he to storm to get "room."

Sir, he made quite as much of that sort of history as you ever will. Mr. President, do you remember the last chapter in that history? It is soon read. Oh! I wish we could but understand its moral. Ammon's son (so was Alexander named), after all his victories, died drunk in Babylon! The vast empire he conquered to "get room" became the prey of the generals he had trained; it was disparted, torn to pieces, and so ended. Sir, there is a very significant appendix; it is this: The descendants of the Greeks—of Alexander's Greeks—are now governed by a descendant of Attila!

Mr. President, while we are fighting for room let us ponder deeply this appendix. I was somewhat amazed the other day to hear the senator from Michigan declare that Europe had quite forgotten us till these battles waked them up. I suppose the senator feels grateful to the President for "waking up" Europe. Does the President, who is, I hope, read in civic as well as military lore, remember the saying of one who had pored upon history long—long, too, upon man, his nature and true destiny? Montesquieu did not think highly of this way of "waking up." "Happy," says he, "is that nation whose annals are tiresome."

The senator from Michigan has a different view of this. He thinks that a nation is not distinguished until it is distinguished in war; he fears that the slumbering faculties of Europe have not been able to ascertain that there are twenty millions of Anglo-Saxons here making railroads and canals, and speeding all the arts of peace to the utmost accomplishment of the most refined civilization. They do not know it! And what is the wonderful expedient which this democratic method of making history would adopt in order to make us known? Storming cities, desolating peaceful, happy homes, shooting men—aye, sir, such is war—and shooting women, too!

Sir, I have read in some account of your battle of Monterey, of a lovely Mexican girl, who, with the benevolence of an angel in her bosom and the robust courage of a hero in her heart, was busily engaged during the bloody conflict, amid the crash of falling houses, the groans of the dying, and the wild shriek of battle, in carrying water to slake the burning thirst of the wounded of either host. While bending over a wounded American soldier a cannon-ball struck her and blew her to atoms! Sir, I do not charge my brave, generous-hearted countrymen who fought that fight with this. No, no! We who send them—we who know that scenes like this, which might send tears of sorrow "down Pluto's iron cheek," are the invariable, inevitable attendants on war—we are accountable for this. And this—this is the way we are to be made known to Europe. This—this is to be the undying renown of free, republican America! "She has stormed a city—killed many of its inhabitants of both sexes—she has room!" So it will read. Sir, if this were our only history, then may God of his mercy grant that its volume may speedily come to a close.

Why is it, sir, that we, the United States, a people of yester-

day compared with the older nations of the world, should be waging war for territory—for "room?" Look at your country, extending from the Alleghany Mountains to the Pacific Ocean, capable itself of sustaining in comfort a larger population than will be in the whole Union for one hundred years to come. Over this vast expanse of territory your population is now so sparse that I believe we provided, at the last session, a regiment of mounted men to guard the mail from the frontier of Missouri to the mouth of the Columbia; and yet you persist in the ridiculous assertion, "I want room." One would imagine, from the frequent reiteration of the complaint, that you had a bursting, teeming population, whose energy was paralyzed, whose enterprise was crushed, for want of space. Why should we be so weak or wicked as to offer this idle apology for ravaging a neighboring republic? It will impose on no one at home or abroad.

Do we not know, Mr. President, that it is a law never to be repealed that falsehood shall be short-lived? Was it not ordained of old that truth only shall abide forever? Whatever we may say to-day, or whatever we may write in our books, the stern tribunal of history will review it all, detect falsehood, and bring us to judgment before that posterity which shall bless or curse us, as we may act now, wisely or otherwise. We may hide in the grave (which awaits us all) in vain; we may hope there, like the foolish bird that hides its head in the sand, in the vain belief that its body is not seen; yet even there this preposterous excuse of want of "room" shall be laid bare and the quick-coming future will decide that it was a hypocritical pretence under which we sought to conceal the avarice which prompted us to covet and to seize by force that which was not ours.

Mr. President, this uneasy desire to augment our territory

has depraved the moral sense and blunted the otherwise keen sagacity of our people. What has been the fate of all nations who have acted upon the idea that they must advance! Our young orators cherish this notion with a fervid but fatally mistaken zeal. They call it by the mysterious name of "destiny." "Our destiny," they say, is "onward," and hence they argue, with ready sophistry, the propriety of seizing upon any territory and any people that may lie in the way of our "fated" advance. Recently these progressives have grown classical; some assiduous student of antiquities has helped them to a patron saint. They have wandered back into the desolated Pantheon, and there, among the polytheistic relics of that "pale mother of dead empires," they have found a god whom these Romans, centuries gone by, baptized "Terminus."

Sir, I have heard much and read somewhat of this gentleman Terminus. Alexander, of whom I have spoken, was a devotee of this divinity. We have seen the end of him and his empire. It was said to be an attribute of this god that he must always advance and never recede. So both republican and imperial Rome believed. It was, as they said, their destiny. And for a while it did seem to be even so. Roman Terminus did advance. Under the eagles of Rome he was carried from his home on the Tiber to the farthest East on the one hand, and to the far West, among the then barbarous tribes of western Europe, on the other.

But at length the time came when retributive justice had become "a destiny." The despised Gaul calls out the contemned Goth, and Attila with his Huns answers back the battle-shout to both. The "blue-eyed nations of the North," in succession or united, pour forth their countless hosts of warriors upon Rome and Rome's always-advancing god Terminus. And now the battle-axe of the barbarian strikes down the con-

quering eagle of Rome. Terminus at last recedes, slowly at first, but finally he is driven to Rome, and from Rome to Byzantium. Whoever would know the further fate of this Roman deity, so recently taken under the patronage of American democracy, may find ample gratification of his curiosity in the luminous pages of Gibbon's "Decline and Fall."

Such will find that Rome thought as you now think, that it was her destiny to conquer provinces and nations, and no doubt she sometimes said, as you say, "I will conquer a peace," and where now is she, the mistress of the world? The spider weaves his web in her palaces, the owl sings his watch-song in her towers. Teutonic power now lords it over the servile remnant, the miserable memento of old and once omnipotent Rome. Sad, very sad, are the lessons which time has written for us. Through and in them all I see nothing but the inflexible execution of that old law which ordains as eternal that cardinal rule, "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's goods, nor anything which is his." Since I have lately heard so much about the dismemberment of Mexico I have looked back to see how, in the course of events, which some call "Providence," it has fared with other nations who engaged in this work of dismemberment. I see that in the latter half of the eighteenth century three powerful nations, Russia, Austria, and Prussia, united in the dismemberment of Poland. They said, too, as you say, "It is our destiny." They "wanted room." Doubtless each of these thought, with his share of Poland, his power was too strong ever to fear invasion, or even insult. One had his California, another his New Mexico, and the third his Vera Cruz. Did they remain untouched and incapable of harm? Alas! no—far, very far, from it. Retributive justice must fulfil its destiny, too.

A very few years pass off, and we hear of a new man, a Corsican lieutenant, the self-named "armed soldier of democracy," Napoleon. He ravages Austria, covers her land with blood, drives the Northern Cæsar from his capital, and sleeps in his palace. Austria may now remember how her power trampled upon Poland. Did she not pay dear, very dear, for her California?

But has Prussia no atonement to make? You see this same Napoleon, the blind instrument of Providence, at work there. The thunders of his cannon at Jena proclaim the work of retribution for Poland's wrongs; and the successors of the Great Frederick, the drill-sergeant of Europe, are seen flying across the sandy plain that surrounds their capital, right glad if they may escape captivity or death. But how fares it with the Autocrat of Russia? Is he secure in his share of the spoils of Poland? No. Suddenly we see, sir, six hundred thousand armed men marching to Moscow. Does his Vera Cruz protect him now? Far from it. Blood, slaughter, desolation spread abroad over the land, and finally the conflagration of the old commercial metropolis of Russia closes the retribution she must pay for her share in the dismemberment of her weak and impotent neighbor.

Mr. President, a mind more prone to look for the judgments of heaven in the doings of men than mine cannot fail in this to see the providence of God. When Moscow burned, it seemed as if the earth was lighted up that the nations might behold the scene. As that mighty sea of fire gathered and heaved and rolled upward and yet higher till its flames licked the stars and fired the whole heavens, it did seem as though the God of the nations was writing in characters of flame on the front of his throne that doom that shall fall upon the strong nation which tramples in scorn upon the weak. And

what fortune awaits him, the appointed executor of this work, when it was all done? He, too, conceived the notion that his destiny pointed onward to universal dominion. France was too small—Europe, he thought, should bow down before him.

But as soon as this idea took possession of his soul, he, too, becomes powerless. His Terminus must recede, too. Right there, while he witnessed the humiliation and doubtless meditated the subjugation of Russia, He who holds the winds in his fist gathered the snows of the north and blew them upon his six hundred thousand men; they fled—they froze—they perished. And now the mighty Napoleon, who had resolved on universal dominion, he, too, is summoned to answer for the violation of that ancient law, "Thou shalt not covet anything which is thy neighbor's." How is the mighty fallen! He, beneath whose proud footstep Europe trembled, he is now an exile at Elba, and now finally a prisoner on the rock of St. Helena, and there, on a barren island, in an unfrequented sea, in the crater of an extinguished volcano, there is the death-bed of the mighty conqueror. All his annexations have come to that! His last hour is now come, and he, the man of destiny, he who had rocked the world as with the throes of an earthquake, is now powerless, still—even as a beggar, so he died. On the wings of a tempest that raged with unwonted fury, up to the throne of the only Power that controlled him while he lived, went the fiery soul of that wonderful warrior, another witness to the existence of that eternal decree that they who do not rule in righteousness shall perish from the earth. He has found "room" at last.

And France,—she, too, has found "room." Her "eagles" now no longer scream along the banks of the Danube, the Po, and the Borysthenes. They have returned home, to their old

eyrie, between the Alps, the Rhine, and the Pyrenees. So shall it be with yours. You may carry them to the loftiest peaks of the Cordilleras, they may wave with insolent triumph in the halls of the Montezumas, the armed men of Mexico may quail before them, but the weakest hand in Mexico, uplifted in prayer to the God of Justice, may call down against you a Power in the presence of which the iron hearts of your warriors shall be turned into ashes.

BRYANT

WILLIAM CULLEN BRYANT, a noted American poet and journalist, was born in Cummington, Massachusetts, November 3, 1794. He was educated at Williams College, studied law and was admitted to the bar in 1815. After ten years' successful practice in the neighboring town of Plainfield and at Great Barrington, in Berkshire county, he removed to New York city in 1825, there becoming one of the editors of the "Evening Post," and in 1828, its editor-in-chief, a position which he held up to the time of his death in New York city, June 12, 1878. In 1807, at the age of thirteen, he published "The Embargo," a political satire in verse, but no collection of his scattered verses was made until 1821. A second collection was made in 1832, and later volumes of his poetry included "The Fountain and Other Poems," 1842; "The White-Footed Deer, and Other Poems," 1844; "Thirty Poems," 1864; and blank verse translations of the Iliad and Odyssey, 1870-71. A volume of "Orations and Addresses" was issued in 1873, and his complete works in four volumes edited by Park Godwin, his son-in-law, in 1884.

WELCOME TO LOUIS KOSSUTH

DELIVERED AT A BANQUET GIVEN BY THE PRESS OF NEW YORK, DECEMBER 15, 1851

LET me ask you to imagine the contest, in which the United States asserted their independence of Great Britain, had been unsuccessful, that our armies, through treason or a league of tyrants against us, had been broken and scattered, that the great men who led them, and who swayed our councils, our Washington, our Franklin, and the venerable President of the American Congress, had been driven forth as exiles. If there had existed at that day, in any part of the civilized world, a powerful republic, with institutions resting on the same foundations of liberty, which our own countrymen sought to establish, would there have been in that republic any hospitality too cordial, any sympathy too deep, any zeal for their glorious but unfortunate cause,

too fervent or too active to be shown toward these illustrious fugitives? Gentlemen, the case I have supposed is before you. The Washingtons, the Franklins, the Hancocks of Hungary, driven out by a far worse tyranny than was ever endured here, are wanderers in foreign lands. Some of them have sought a refuge in our country—one sits with his company our guest to-night, and we must measure the duty we owe them by the same standard which we would have had history apply, if our ancestors had met with a fate like theirs.

I have compared the exiled Hungarians to the great men of our own history. Difficulty, my brethren, is the nurse of greatness; a harsh nurse, who roughly rocks her foster-children into strength and athletic proportion. The mind grappling with great aims and wrestling with mighty ingredients, grows, by a certain necessity, to their stature. Scarce anything so convinces me of the capacity of the human intellect for indefinite expansion in the different stages of its being, as this power of enlarging itself to the compass of surrounding emergencies. These men have been trained to greatness by a quicker and surer method than a peaceful country and a tranquil period can know.

But it is not merely or principally for their personal qualities that we honor them; we honor them for the cause in which they failed so gloriously. Great issues hang upon that cause, and great interests of mankind are crushed by its downfall. I was on the continent of Europe when the treason of Görgey laid Hungary bound at the feet of the Tsar. Europe was at that time in the midst of the reaction; the ebb tide was rushing violently back, sweeping all that the friends of freedom had planned into the black bosom of the deep. In France the liberty of the press was extinct—Paris in a state of siege—the soldiery of that republic had

just quenched in blood the freedom of Rome—Austria had suppressed liberty in northern Italy—absolutism was restored in Russia, along the Rhine, and in the towns and villages of Würtemburg and Bavaria, troops withdrawn from the barracks, and garrisons filled the streets and kept the inhabitants quiet with the bayonet at their breast. Hungary at that moment alone upheld, and upheld with a firm hand and dauntless heart, the blazing torch of liberty. To Hungary were turned the eyes, to Hungary clung the hopes of all who did not despair of the freedom of Europe.

I recollect that while the armies of Russia were moving like a tempest from the North upon the Hungarian host, the progress of events was watched with the deepest solicitude by the people of Germany. I was at that time in Munich, the splendid capital of Bavaria. The Germans seemed for the time to have put off their usual character, and scrambled for the daily prints, wet from the press, with such eagerness that I almost thought myself in America. The news of the catastrophe at last arrived; Görgey had betrayed the cause of Hungary, and yielded to the demands of the Russians. Immediately a funeral gloom settled like a noonday darkness upon the city. I heard the muttered exclamations of the people, "It is all over—the last hope of European liberty is gone."

Russia did not misjudge. If she had allowed Hungary to become independent, or free, the reaction in favor of absolutism had been incomplete; there would have been one perilous example of successful resistance to despotism—in one corner of Europe a flame would have been kept alive, at which the other nations might have rekindled, among themselves, the light of liberty. Hungary was subdued; but does any one who hears me believe that the present state of things

in Europe will last? The despots themselves fear that it will not; and made cruel by their fears, are heaping chain on chain around the limbs of their subjects.

They are hastening the event they dread. Every added shackle galls, into a more fiery impotence, those who wear them. I look with mingling hope and horror to the day—a day bloodier, perhaps, than we have yet seen—when the exasperated nations shall snap their chains and start to their feet. It may well be that Hungary, made less patient of the yoke by the remembrance of her own many and glorious struggles for independence, and better fitted than other nations, by the peculiar structure of her institutions, for founding the liberty of her citizens on a rational basis, will take the lead. In that glorious and hazardous enterprise, in that hour of care, need, and peril, I hope she will be cheered and strengthened with aid from this side of the Atlantic; aid given not with the stinted hand, not with a cowardly and selfish apprehension, lest we should not err on the safe side—wisely if you please. I care not with how broad a regard to the future, but in large, generous, effectual measure.

And you, our guest, fearless, eloquent, large of heart and of mind, whose one thought is the salvation of oppressed Hungary, unfortunate but undiscouraged, struck down in the battle of liberty, but great in defeat, and gathering strength for future triumphs, receive this action at our hands, that in this great attempt of man to repossess himself of the rights which God gave him, though the strife be waged under a distant belt of longitude, and with the mightiest despotism of the world, the Press of America takes part with you and your countrymen. I give you—"LOUIS KOSSUTH."

ADDRESS AT THE FOUNDING OF THE METROPOLITAN ART MUSEUM

DELIVERED AT THE UNION CLUB HOUSE, NOVEMBER 23, 1869

WE ARE assembled, my friends, to consider the subject of founding in this city a museum of art, a repository of the productions of artists of every class, which shall be in some measure worthy of this great metropolis and of the wide empire of which New York is the commercial centre. I understand that no rivalry with any other project is contemplated, no competition save with similar institutions in other countries, and then only such modest competition as a museum in its infancy may aspire to hold with those which were founded centuries ago, and are enriched with the additions made by the munificence of successive generations. No precise method of reaching this result has been determined on, but the object of the present meeting is to awaken the public, so far as our proceedings can influence the general mind, to the importance of taking early and effectual measures for founding such a museum as I have described.

Our city is the third great city of the civilized world. Our republic has already taken its place among the great powers of the earth; it is great in extent, great in population, great in the activity and enterprise of her people. It is the richest nation in the world if paying off an enormous national debt with a rapidity unexampled in history be any proof of riches; the richest in the world if contented submission to heavy taxation be a sign of wealth; the richest in the world if quietly to allow itself to be annually plundered of immense sums by men

who seek public stations for their individual profit be a token of public prosperity.

My friends, if a tenth part of what is every year stolen from us in this way, in the city where we live, under pretence of the public service, and poured profusely into the coffers of political rogues, were expended on a museum of art, we might have, deposited in spacious and stately buildings, collections formed of works left by the world's greatest artists, which would be the pride of our country. We might have an annual revenue which would bring to the museum every stray statue and picture of merit for which there should be no ready sale to individuals, every smaller collection in the country which its owner could no longer conveniently keep, every noble work by the artists of former ages which by any casualty, after long remaining on the walls of some ancient building, should be again thrown upon the world.

But what have we done—numerous as our people are, and so rich as to be contentedly cheated and plundered, what have we done toward founding such a repository? We have hardly made a step toward it. Yet, beyond the sea there is the little kingdom of Saxony, with an area even less than that of Massachusetts, and a population but little larger, possessing a museum of the fine arts, marvellously rich, which no man who visits the continent of Europe is willing to own that he has not seen.

There is Spain, a third-rate power of Europe, and poor besides, with a museum of fine arts at her capital the opulence and extent of which absolutely bewilder the visitor. I will not speak of France or of England, conquering nations, which have gathered their treasures of art in part from regions overrun by their armies; nor yet of Italy, the fortunate inheritor of so many glorious productions of her own artists. But there

are Holland and Belgium, kingdoms almost too small to be heeded by the greater powers of Europe in the consultations which decide the destinies of nations, and these little kingdoms have their public collections of art, the resort of admiring visitors from all parts of the civilized world.

But in our country, when the owner of a private gallery of art desires to leave his treasures where they can be seen by the public, he looks in vain for any institution to which he can send them. A public-spirited citizen desires to employ a favorite artist upon some great historical picture; there are no walls on which it can hang in public sight. A large collection of works of art, made at great cost, and with great pains, gathered perhaps during a lifetime, is for sale in Europe. We may find here men willing to contribute to purchase it, but if it should be brought to our country there is no edifice here to give it hospitality.

In 1857, during a visit to Spain, I found in Madrid a rich private collection of pictures, made by Medraza, an aged painter, during a long life, and at a period when frequent social and political changes in that country dismantled many palaces of the old nobility of the works of art which adorned them. In that collection were many pictures by the illustrious elder artists of Italy, Spain, and Holland. The whole might have been bought for half its value, but if it had been brought over to our country we had no gallery to hold it.

The same year I stood before the famous Campana collection of marbles, at Rome, which was then waiting for a purchaser—a noble collection, busts and statues of the ancient philosophers, orators, and poets, the majestic forms of Roman senators, the deities of ancient mythology,

"The fair humanities of old religion,"

but if they had been purchased by our countrymen and landed here, we should have been obliged to leave them in boxes, just as they were packed.

Moreover, we require an extensive public gallery to contain the greater works of our own painters and sculptors. The American soil is prolific of artists. The fine arts blossom not only in the populous regions of our country, but even in its solitary places. Go where you will, into whatever museum of art in the Old World, you find there artists from the new, contemplating or copying the masterpieces of art which they contain. Our artists swarm in Italy. When I was last at Rome, two years since, I found the number of American artists residing there as two to one compared with those from the British isles. But there are beginners among us who have not the means of resorting to distant countries for that instruction in art which is derived from carefully studying works of acknowledged excellence. For these a gallery is needed at home which shall vie with those abroad, if not in the multitude, yet in the merit of the works it contains.

Yet further, it is unfortunate for our artists, our painters especially, that they too often find their genius cramped by the narrow space in which it is constrained to exert itself. It is like a bird in a cage which can only take short flights from one perch to another and longs to stretch its wings in an ampler atmosphere. Producing works for private dwellings, our painters are for the most part obliged to confine themselves to cabinet pictures, and have little opportunity for that larger treatment of important subjects which a greater breadth of canvas would allow them, and by which the higher and nobler triumphs of their art have been achieved.

There is yet another view of the subject, and a most important one. When I consider, my friends, the prospect which

opens before this great mart of the western world I am moved by feelings which I feel it somewhat difficult clearly to define. The growth of our city is already wonderfully rapid; it is every day spreading itself into the surrounding region, and overwhelming it like an inundation. Now that our great railway has been laid from the Atlantic to the Pacific, Eastern Asia and Western Europe will shake hands over our republic. New York will be the mart from which Europe will receive a large proportion of the products of China, and will become not only a centre of commerce for the New World, but for that region which is to Europe the most remote part of the Old. A new impulse will be given to the growth of our city, which I cannot contemplate without an emotion akin to dismay. Men will flock in greater numbers than ever before to plant themselves on a spot so favorable to the exchange of commodities between distant regions; and here will be an aggregation of human life, a concentration of all that ennobles and all that degrades humanity, on a scale which the imagination cannot venture to measure. To great cities resort not only all that is eminent in talent, all that is splendid in genius, and all that is active in philanthropy; but also all that is most dexterous in villainy, and all that is most foul in guilt. It is in the labyrinths of such mighty and crowded populations that crime finds its safest lurking-places; it is there that vice spreads its most seductive and fatal snares, and sin is pampered and festers and spreads its contagion in the greatest security.

My friends, it is important that we should encounter the temptations to vice in this great and too rapidly growing capital by attractive entertainments of an innocent and improving character. We have libraries and reading-rooms, and this is well; we have also spacious halls for musical entertainments, and that also is well; but there are times when we do not care

to read and are satiate with the listening to sweet sounds, and when we more willingly contemplate works of art. It is the business of the true philanthropist to find means of gratifying this preference. We must be beforehand with vice in our arrangements for all that gives grace and cheerfulness to society. The influence of works of art is wholesome, ennobling, instructive. Besides the cultivation of the sense of beauty—in other words, the perception of order, symmetry, proportion of parts, which is of near kindred to the moral sentiments—the intelligent contemplation of a great gallery of works of art is a lesson in history, a lesson in biography, a lesson in the antiquities of different countries. Half our knowledge of the customs and modes of life among the ancient Greeks and Romans is derived from the remains of ancient art.

Let it be remembered to the honor of art that if it has ever been perverted to the purposes of vice, it has only been at the bidding of some corrupt court or at the desire of some opulent and powerful voluptuary whose word was law. When intended for the general eye no such stain rests on the works of art. Let me close with an anecdote of the influence of a well-known work. I was once speaking to the poet Rogers in commendation of the painting of Ary Scheffer entitled "Christ the Consoler." "I have an engraving of it," he answered, "hanging at my bedside, where it meets my eye every morning." The aged poet, over whom already impended the shadow that shrouds the entrance to the next world, found his morning meditations guided by that work to the founder of our religion.

FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE MERCANTILE LIBRARY ASSOCIATION

NEW YORK, NOVEMBER 10, 1870

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN,—I esteem myself highly fortunate in being able to congratulate the members of the Mercantile Library Association on having reached the fiftieth anniversary of their life. Forty-five years ago, when I first came to live in the city of New York, that institution was in the early infancy of which your president has just given an interesting account. I remember, very well, that the public-spirited young gentlemen by whom it was founded expected much from it in the future. They hoped, and the hope was not vain, that it would greatly aid in forming the minds of the younger part of the mercantile class to liberal tastes and to generous views of their duty to their country and to mankind, and that it would be in some measure a safeguard against the temptations which beset young men in a populous city. Those who then sat by its cradle, if they survive, are now aged men; those whose birth was coeval with its origin are men of mature age who have passed the zenith of life; the books which were collected in its first year, to form the beginning of what is now a flourishing library, belong to the literature of a past generation. Yet, in founding this institution, the men of that day left a noble legacy to future times. While other institutions have risen and fallen it has continued to grow and to extend its beneficial influences with the growth of our city; not, indeed, in the same proportion, but steadily and with a sure advance, till now its prosperity and duration seem almost beyond the reach of

accident. I learn that there is no library in the country which increases so fast as that which belongs to this association, and that within the last ten years it has more than doubled the number of its volumes. If it proceeds at this rate it will eventually have a library which will command the admiration of the world and become the pride of our country.

In the years yet to come, far in the depths of the future, the young men who search among the old books of the library will say to each other: "See with what reading our ancestors entertained themselves many centuries since, and how the language has changed since that time! We can laugh yet at the humor of Irving, in spite of the antiquated diction. What a fiery spirit animates the quaint sentences of the old novelist Cooper! In these verses of Longfellow we still perceive the sweetness of the numbers and the pathos of the thoughts, and wonder not that the maidens of that distant age wept over the pages of Evangeline. Here," they will add, "are the scientific works of that distant age. Clever men were these ancestors of ours; diligent inquirers; fortunate discoverers of scientific truth, but how far in its attainment below the height which we have since reached!"

What I have just now imagined supposes our flourishing library to escape destruction by war and by casual fire. Ah, my friends, never may the fate of unhappy Strasburg be ours! to lie for weeks under a hailstorm of iron and a rain of fire, showered from the engines of destruction, which Milton properly makes the guilty invention of the sinning angels, and doomed to see her library, rich with the priceless treasures of past centuries, suddenly turned to ashes. But whatever may be the fate of our library, the association itself is not so easily destroyed. If the library perish, the same spirit

which founded it first will restore it so far as restoration is possible. The association, I venture to predict, will subsist till this great mart of commerce shall be a mart no longer; till the mercantile class shall have disappeared from the spot where it stands, and New York shall have dwindled to a fishing town.

But will this ever be? Will our great city share the fate of Tyre and Sidon, whose merchants were princes, and which are now but Arab villages, with a few caiques and here and there a felucca moored in their clear but shallow waters, choked with the ruins of palaces? Will she become like Carthage, once mistress of flourishing colonies, but now a desert; like Corinth, once the seat of a vast commerce—opulent, luxurious, magnificent Corinth—now a mere cluster of houses overlooked by a dismantled and moldering citadel?

Or, to come down to later times, will this city decay like Amsterdam, the mother of New York, and once the centre of the world's commerce? Or like Genoa, surnamed the proud, and Venice, once the mistress of the Adriatic—cities which after having successively wielded the commerce of the East, and made Italian the language of commerce in all the ports of the Levant, have long since ceased to hold a place among the great marts of the world?

I answer that none of these cities had the same firm and durable basis of commercial prosperity as our New York. It was their enterprise in opening channels of trade; it was their conquests and colonies which gave them their temporary prosperity. They had no broad, well-peopled region around them, under the same government with themselves, whose superabundant products it was their office to exchange with other countries. Their prosperity was built on narrow foundations, and it fell. Our circumstances are different.

Here is a republic of vast extent, stretching from the sea which bathes the western coast of Europe to that which washes the eastern shore of Asia—a region of fertile plains, rich valleys, noble forests, mountains big with mines, watercourses whose sands are gold, mighty rivers, railways going forth from our great cities to every point of the compass, and covering an immense territory with their intersections, and not a hindrance to commerce between city and city or between sea and sea, or on our great rivers, or on the borders of the States forming our confederation. This mighty region, alive with an energetic population, is flanked with seaports through which the products sent by us to other countries must pass, and through which the merchandise sent us in exchange must be received. They are therefore an indispensable part of our national economy. Their prosperity is necessary, inevitable, and will endure while our political institution remains as it now is.

But if it should come to pass that this fortunate order of things is broken up, if this great republic should fall to pieces and become divided into a group of independent commonwealths, and if an illiberal legislation should obstruct the channels of trade now so fortunately open over all our vast territory, there are none of our marts of exchange for whose future prosperity I could answer. Some would fall into a slow decay, some pass into a rapid decline; some would become like Ascalon on the coast of Palestine, once a harbor crowded with shipping, but when I saw it, a desolate spot, where the sea-sand had drifted upon the foundations of temples and palaces, invaded the harvest fields, and moving before the wind, had entered the olive groves and piled itself among them to the tops of the trees.

Our security from such unhappy results will, in a good

degree, lie in such institutions as this, and in other means of a like character, the object of which is to diffuse knowledge, to open men's eyes to their true interests, and accustom them to large and generous views of the relations of communities to each other and to the world at large. For this reason let us hope for the permanent and increasing prosperity of the Mercantile Library Association.

TALFOURD

SIR THOMAS NOON TALFOURD, a once famous poet and orator, was born at Reading in 1795. He was educated at the local grammar school under Dr. Valpy, and in 1821 was called to the bar. In 1833 he became a serjeant-at-law and between 1835 and 1841, and again between 1847 and 1849, he was a Whig member of Parliament for Reading. When he retired in 1849 he was made justice of common pleas and was knighted. He wrote four tragedies, one of which, "Ion," was brought out by Macready at Covent Garden in 1835. He made a number of famous speeches in behalf of copyright. He died in 1854.

IN DEFENCE OF SHELLEY'S WORKS

DELIVERED IN THE COURT OF QUEEN'S BENCH, JUNE 23, 1841

[In April, 1840, Mr. Henry Hetherington was convicted of publishing certain libels on the Old Testament. On his release from prison he in turn charged Edward Moxon with publishing, in Shelley's works, "a scandalous, impious, profane, and malicious libel of and concerning the Holy Scriptures, and of and concerning Almighty God." The eloquent author of "Ion" made the following brilliant plea in the publisher's defence:]

IT HAS sometimes been my lot to express, and much oftener to feel, a degree of anxiety in addressing juries, which has painfully diminished the little power which I can ever command in representing the interests committed to my charge; but never has that feeling been so excited, and so justified, by any occasion as that on which it is my duty to address you. I am called from the court in which I usually practise, to defend from the odious charge of blasphemy one with whom I have been acquainted for many years—one whom I have always believed incapable of wilful offence toward God or toward man—one who was introduced to me in early and happy days, by the dearest of my friends who

are gone before me—by Charles Lamb—to whom the wife of the defendant was as an adopted daughter; and who, dying, committed the interests which he left her in the products of his life of kindness to my charge. Would to God that the spirit which pervaded his being could decide the fate of this strange prosecution; I should only have to pronounce his name and to receive your verdict.

Apart from these personal considerations, there is something in the nature of the charge itself, however unjustly applied to the party accused, which must depress a Christian advocate addressing a Christian jury. On all other cases of accusation he would implore the jurors, sworn to decide between the accuser and the defendant, to lay aside every prepossession, to forget every rumor, to strip themselves of every prejudice, to suppress every affection, which could prevent the exercise of a free and unclouded judgment; and having made this appeal, or having forborne to make it as needless, he would regard the jury-box as a sacred spot, raised above all encircling influences, to which he might address the arguments of justice and mercy with the assurance of obtaining a decision only divested of the certainty of unerring truth by the imperfection of human evidence and of human reason.

But in this case you cannot grant—I cannot ask—the cold impartiality which on all other charges may be sought and expected from English juries. Sworn on the Gospel to try a charge of wickedly and profanely attempting to bring that Gospel and the holy religion which it reveals into disbelief and contempt, you are reminded even by that oath—if it were possible you could ever forget—of the deep, the solemn, the imperishable interest you have in those sacred things which the defendant is charged with assailing.

The feelings which such a charge awakens are not like those

political differences which it is delightful sometimes to forget or to trample on; or those local partialities which it is ennobling to forsake for a wider sphere of contemplation; or those hasty opinions which the daily press, in its vivid course, has scattered over our thoughts, and which we are proud sometimes to bring to the test of dispassionate reflection; or those worldly interests which, if they sway the honorable mind at all, incline it to take part against them; but the emotions which this charge enkindles are intertwined with all that endears the past and peoples the future—with all that renders this life noble by enriching it with the hope of that which is to come.

If the passages which have been read to you—torn asunder from the connection in which they stand, regarded without reference to the time, the object, the mode of their publication—should array you at this moment almost as plaintiffs, personally wronged and insulted, against their publisher, I must not complain; for I shall not be provoked, even by the peculiarity of this charge, to defend Mr. Moxon by a suggestion which can violate the associations which are intertwined with all that is dear to you.

He would rather submit to the utmost consequences which the selfish recklessness of this prosecution could entail, if you should sanction, and the court hereafter should support, its aim; he would rather be severed from the family whom he cherishes, and from the society of the good and the great in our literature, which he is privileged to share; than he would obtain immunity by a recourse to those weapons which the prosecutor would fain present to his choice.

Neither will I, notwithstanding the anticipation of my learned friend, ask you to palter with your consciences, and, because you may doubt or deny the policy of the law which is

thus set in action, invite you to do other than administer justice according to your oath and your duty.

I take my stand on Christian ground; I base my defence on the recognized law; and if I do not show you that the Christianity which the prosecutor most needlessly presumes to vindicate, and the law which with unhallowed hands he is striving to pervert, justify your verdict of acquittal, I am content that you should become the instruments of his attempt to retort the penalties of his own sentence on one who never wronged him even in thought—that you should aid him to render the law under which he has suffered odious, by sanctioning the odious application which he contemplates; and that at his bidding you should scatter through the loftiest and serenest paths of literature, distress, and doubt, and dismay, awarding him that success which, "if not victory, is yet revenge."

The charge which Mr. Moxon is called upon to answer is, that with a wicked intention to bring the holy Scriptures and the Christian religion into contempt, he published the volume which is in evidence before you, and which is characterized as a libel on that religion, on the Scriptures, and on Almighty God.

I speak advisedly when I say the whole volume is thus indicted; it must be so considered in point of justice—it is so charged in point of form. The indictment, indeed, sets forth four passages, torn violently asunder from their context; yet it does not charge them as separate libels, but as portions of one "impious, blasphemous, profane, and malicious libel," in different parts of which the selected parts are found.

Now, these are not all to be found even in one poem, for the first three being in poetry, the last is taken from a mass of prose appended to the first poem of "Queen Mab," and intervening between it and a poem entitled "Alastor," which is

the next in the series. And if this were not the form of the record, can it be doubted that, in point of justice, the scope, the object, the tendency of the entire publication, must be determined before you can decide on the guilt or innocence of the party who has thus published the passages charged as blasphemous?

Supposing some question of law should be raised on the sufficiency of the indictment in which they are inserted, and they should be copied necessarily for the elucidation of the argument in one of the reports in which the decisions of this court are perpetuated, would the reporter, the law bookseller, the officer of the court who should hand the volume to a barrister, be guilty of blasphemy?

Or if they should appear in some correct report, partaking of a more popular form, and that report should be indicted as containing them, what form would the question of the guilt or innocence of the publisher assume? Would it not be, whether he had been honestly anxious to lay before the world the history of an unexampled attempt to degrade and destroy the law, under pretence of asserting it; or whether he was studious to disseminate some fragments of strange and fearful audacity, and had professed to report an extraordinary trial, only as a pretext to cover the popular dissemination of blasphemy? And would not the form, the commentary, the occasion, the price, all be material in deciding whether the work were laudable or guilty—whether, as a whole, it tended to good or to evil?

These passages, like details and pictures in works of anatomy and surgery, are either innocent or criminal, according to the accompaniments which surround them, and the class to whom they are addressed. If really intended for the eye of the scientific student, they are most innocent; but if so

published as to manifest another intention, they will not be protected from legal censure by the flimsy guise of science.

By a similar test let this publication be judged! If its whole tenor lead you to believe that the dissemination of irreligious feelings was its object—nay, that such will be its natural consequence—let Mr. Hetherington have his triumph; but if you believe that these words, however, offensive when abstractedly taken, form a part of a great intellectual and moral phenomenon, which may be disclosed to the class of readers who alone will purchase the volume, not only without injury, but to their instruction, you will joyfully find Mr. Moxon as free from blasphemy in contemplation of the strictest law, as I know he is in purpose and in spirit.

The passages selected as specimens of the indicted libel are found in a complete edition of the works of Percy Bysshe Shelley—a work comprising more than twenty thousand lines of verse, and occupy something less than the three hundredth part of the volume which contains them. The book presents the entire intellectual history—true and faithful, because traced in the series of those works which were its events—of one of the most extraordinary persons ever gifted and doomed to illustrate the nobleness, the grandeur, the imperfections, and the progress of human genius—whom it pleased God to take from this world while the process harmonizing his stupendous powers was yet incomplete, but not before it had indicated its beneficent workings.

It is edited by his widow, a lady endowed with great and original talent, who, as she states in her preface, hastens "to fulfil an important duty, that of giving the productions of a sublime genius to the world, with all the correctness possible, and of, at the same time, detailing the history of these productions as they sprang, warm and living, from his heart and

brain." And, accordingly, the poems are all connected together by statements as to the circumstances under which they were written, and the feelings which inspired them. The "alterations (says Mrs. Shelley) his opinions underwent ought to be recorded, for they form his history."

The first of these works is a poem, written at the age of eighteen, entitled "Queen Mab"—a composition marked with nothing to attract the casual reader; irregular in versification, wild, disjointed, visionary; often difficult to be understood even by a painful student of poetry, and sometimes wholly unintelligible even to him; but containing as much to wonder at, to ponder on, to weep over, as any half-formed work of genius which ever emanated from the vigor and the rashness of youth.

This poem, which I shall bring before you presently, is followed by the marvellous series of works of which "Alastor," "The Revolt of Islam," the "Prometheus Unbound," and "The Cenci" form the principal, exhibiting a continuous triumph of mellowing and consecrating influences, down to the moment when sudden death shrouded the poet's career from the observation of mortals.

Now the question is, whether it is blasphemy to present to the world—say rather to the calm, the laborious, the patient searcher after wisdom and beauty, who alone will peruse this volume—the awful mistakes, the mighty struggles, the strange depressions, and the imperfect victories of such a spirit, because the picture has some passages of frightful gloom.

I am far from contending that everything which genius has in rashness or in wantonness produced becomes, when once committed to the press, the inalienable property of mankind. Such a principle, indeed, seems to be involved in an

argument which was recently sanctioned by the authority of a cabinet minister more distinguished even as a profound thinker and an eloquent and accomplished critic than by political station.

When I last urged the claim of the descendants of men of genius to be the guardians of their fame, as well as the recipients of its attendant rewards, I was met with denial on the plea that, from some fastidiousness of taste, or some overniceness of moral apprehension, the hereditary representatives of a great writer may cover his works with artificial oblivion. I have asked, whether, if a poet has written "some line which, dying, he may wish to blot," he shall not be allowed by the insatiate public to blot it dying; and I have asked in vain!

Fielding and Richardson have been quoted as writers whose works, multiplying as they will through all time the sources of innocent enjoyment, might have been suppressed by some too dainty moralist. Now, admitting that the tendency of Fielding's works, taken as a whole, is as invigorating as it is delightful, I fear there are chapters which, if taken from their connection—apart from the healthful atmosphere in which their impurities evaporate and die—and printed at some penny cost for dissemination among the young, would justly incur the censure of that law which has too long withheld its visitations from those who have sought a detestable profit by spreading cheap corruption through the land.

It may be true, as Dr. Johnson ruled, that Richardson "had taught the passions to move at the command of virtue;" and, as was recently asserted, that Mrs. Hannah More "first learned from his writings those principles of piety by which her life was guided;" but (to leave out of consideration the "Adventures of Pamela," which must sometimes have put Mrs. Hannah More to the blush) I fear that selections might

be made even from the greatest of all prose romances, "Clarissa Harlowe," which the Society for the Suppression of Vice would scarcely endure.

Do I wish them therefore suppressed? No! Because in these massive volumes the antidote is found with the bane; because the effect of Lovelace's daring pleas for vice, and of pictures yet more vicious, is neutralized by the scenes of passion and suffering which surround them; because the unsullied image of heroic purity and beautiful endurance rises fairer from amidst the encircling pollutions, and conquers every feeling but those of admiration and pity.

Yet if detached scenes were, like these passages of Shelley, selected for the prosecution, how could they be defended—but, like them, by reference to the spirit, and intent, and tendency of the entire work from which they were torn? And yet the defence would be less conclusive than that which I now offer; as descriptions which appeal to passion are far less capable of correction by accompanying moralities, than the cold speculations of a wild infidelity by the considerations which the history of their author's mind supplies.

In the wise and just dispensations of Providence great powers are often found associated with weakness or with sorrow; but when these are not blended with the intellectual greatness they countervail, but merely affect the personal fortunes of their possessors,—as when a sanguine temperament leads into vicious excesses—there is no more propriety in unveiling the truth, because it is truth, than in exhibiting the details of some physical disease.

But when the greatness of the poet's intellect contains within itself the elements of tumult and disorder—when the appreciation of the genius, in all its divine relations and all its human lapses, depends on a view of the entire picture,

must it be withheld? It is not a sinful elysium, full of lascivious blandishments, but a heaving chaos of mighty elements, that the publisher of the early productions of Shelley unveils.

In such a case, the more awful the alienation, the more pregnant with good will be the lesson. Shall this life, fevered with beauty, restless with inspiration, be hidden; or, wanting its first blind but gigantic efforts, be falsely, because partially, revealed?

If to trace back the stream of genius from its greatest and most lucid earthly breadth to its remotest fountain is one of the most interesting and instructive objects of philosophic research, shall we—when we have followed that of Shelley through its majestic windings, beneath the solemn glooms of "The Cenci," through the glory-tinged expanses of "The Revolt of Islam," amidst the dreamlike haziness of the "Prometheus"—be forbidden to ascend with painful steps its narrowing course to its furthest spring, because black rocks may encircle the spot whence it rushes into day, and demon shapes—frightful but powerless for harm—may gleam and frown on us beside it?

Having thus endeavored to present to you the foundation of my defence—that the volume in which these passages appear is in its substance historical, and that, so far from being adopted by the compiler, they are presented as necessary to historical truth—I will consider the passages themselves, and the poem in which they appear, with a view to inquire whether they are of a nature capable of being fairly regarded as innoxious in their connection with Shelley's life.

Admitting, as I do, that if published with an aim to commend them to the reader as the breathings or suggestions of truth—nay, that if recklessly published in such a manner as

to present them to the reader for approval, they deserve all the indignation which can be lavished on them, I cannot think, even then, they would have power to injure. They appeal to no passion—they pervert no affection—they find nothing in human nature, frail as it always is, guilty as it sometimes becomes—to work on.

Contemplated apart from the intellectual history of the extraordinary being who produced them, and from which they can never be severed by any reader of this book, they would excite no feelings but those of wonder at their audacity and pity for their weakness. Not only are they incapable of awakening any chords of evil in the soul, but they are ineffectual even to present to it an intelligible heresy. "We understand a fury in the words—but not the words."

What do they import? Is it atheism?—or is it mad defiance of a God by one who believes and hates, yet does not tremble? To the first passage, commencing, "They have three words" —"God, Hell, and Heaven!"—the prosecutor does not venture to affix any meaning at all, but tears them from their context, and alleges that they are part of a libel on the holy Scriptures, though there is no reference in them to the Bible, or to any Scripture doctrine; nor does the indictment supply any definite meaning or reference to explain or to answer.

To the second paragraph—

> "Is there a God?—ay, an Almighty God,
> And vengeful as almighty! Once his voice
> Was heard on earth: earth shudder'd at the sound;
> The fiery-visaged firmament express'd
> Abhorrence, and the grave of nature yawn'd
> To swallow all the dauntless and the good
> That dared to hurl defiance at his throne,
> Girt as it was with power"——

—the indictment does present a most extended innuendo: "Thereby meaning and referring to the Scripture history of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram; and meaning that the said

Korah, Dathan, and Abiram were dauntless and good, and were so dauntless and good for daring to hurl defiance at the throne of Almighty God."

This is, indeed, a flight of the poetry of pleading—a construction which you must find as the undoubted sense of the passage—before you can sustain this part of the accusation. But again, I ask, is there any determinate meaning in these "wild and whirling words?" Are they more than atoms of chaotic thought not yet subsided into harmony—over which the spirit of love has not yet brooded, so as to make them pregnant with life, and beauty, and joy?

But suppose, for a moment, they nakedly assert atheism—never was there an error which, thus incidentally exhibited, had less power to charm. How far it is possible that such a miserable dogma, dexterously insinuated into a perplexed understanding or a corrupted heart, may find reception, I will not venture to speculate, but I venture to affirm that thus nakedly presented, as the dream of a wild fancy, it can at most only glare for a moment, a bloodless phantom, and pass into kindred nothing!

Or do the words rather import a belief in a God—the ruling power of the universe—yet an insane hatred of his attributes? Is it possible to contemplate the creature of a day standing up amidst countless ages, like a shadowy film among the confused grandeur of the universe, thus propelled, with any other feeling than those of wonder and pity?

Or do these words merely import that the name and attributes of the Supreme Being have been abused and perverted by "the oppressors of mankind" for their own purposes, to the misery of the oppressed?

Or do they vibrate and oscillate between all these meanings, so as to leave the mind in a state of perplexity, balancing and

destroying each other? In either case they are powerless for evil. Unlike that seductive infidelity which flatters the pride of the understanding, by glittering sophistry—or that still more dangerous infidelity which gratifies its love of power by bitter sarcasm; or that most dangerous of all, which perverts the sensibilities and corrupts the affections—it resembles that evil of which Milton speaks, when, with a boldness which the fastidious might deem profane, he exclaims,

> "Evil into the mind of God or man
> May come and go, so unapproved, and leave
> No spot or blame behind."

If, regarded in themselves, these passages were endowed with any power of mischief, the manner in which they are introduced in the poem—or rather phantasm of a poem—of "Queen Mab" must surely neutralize them. It has no human interest—no local affinities—no machinery familiar even to thought. It opens in a lyrical measure, wanting even the accomplishment of rhyme, with an apostrophe uttered, no one knows by whom or where, on a sleeping nymph—whether human or divine—the creature of what mythology—on earth or in some other sphere—is unexplained; all we know is, that the lady or spirit is called Ianthe. Thus it begins:

> "How wonderful is Death —
> Death and his brother Sleep!
> One, pale as yonder waning moon,
> With lips of lurid blue;
> The other, rosy as the morn
> When, throned in Ocean's wave,
> It blushes o'er the world;
> Yet both so passing wonderful!
>
> Hath then the gloomy power
> Whose reign is in the tainted sepulchres
> Seized on her sinless soul?
> Must then that peerless form,
> Which love and admiration cannot view
> Without a beating heart — those azure veins
> Which steal like streams along a field of snow —

That lovely outline which is fair
As breathing marble, perish?
Must putrefaction's breath
Leave nothing of this heavenly sight
But loathsomeness and ruin!
Spare nothing but a gloomy theme,
On which the lightest heart might moralize?
Or is it only a sweet slumber
Stealing o'er sensation,
Which the breath of roseate morning
Chaseth into darkness?
Will Ianthe wake again,
And give that faithful bosom joy,
Whose sleepless spirit waits to catch
Light, life, and rapture from her smile?"

The answer to the last question is, that Ianthe will awake, which is expressed in terms appropriately elaborate and mystical. But while she is thus sleeping the Fairy Mab descends —invites the soul of the nymph to quit her form—and conveys it through systems, suns, and worlds to the temple of "The Spirit of Nature," where the Fairy and the Soul enter "The Hall of Spells," and a kind of phantasmagoria passes before them, in which are dimly seen representations of the miseries, oppressions, and hopes of mankind.

Few indeed are the readers who will ever enter the dreary portals of that fane, or gaze on the wild intermixture of half-formed visions and theories which gleam through the hazy prospects seen from its battlements. The discourse of the Fairy—to the few who have followed that dizzy career—is an extraordinary mixture of wild rhapsody on the miseries attendant on humanity, and the supposed errors of its faith, and of fancies "of the moonshine's watery beams."

After the "obstinate questioning" respecting the existence of a God, this Fairy—who is supposed to deny all supernatural existence—calls forth a shape of one whose imaginary being is entirely derived from Christian tradition—Ahasuerus, the Jew—who is said to have scoffed at our Saviour as he bore his cross to Calvary, and to have been

doomed by him to wander on the earth until his second coming.

Of this phantom the question is asked, "Is there a God?" and to him are the words ascribed in answer which form the second and third portions of the prosecutor's charge. Can anything be conceived more inconsistent—more completely self-refuted, and therefore more harmless? The whole machinery, indeed, answers to the description of the Fairy—

> "The matter of which dreams are made,
> Not more endow'd with actual life,
> Than this phantasmal portraiture
> Of wandering human thought."

All, indeed, is fantastical—nothing clear except that atheism, and the materialism on which alone atheism can rest, are refuted in every page. If the being of God is in terms denied—which I deny—it is confessed in substance; and what injury can an author do who one moment deprecates the "deifying the spirit of the universe," and the next himself deifies "the spirit of nature"—speaks of her "eternal breath," and fashions for her "a fitting temple?"

Nay, in this strange poem the spiritual immunities of the soul and its immortal destinies are distinctly asserted amidst all its visionary splendors. The spirit of Ianthe is supposed to arise from the slumbering body and to stand beside it, while the poet thus represents each:

> "'Twas a sight
> Of wonder to behold the body and soul.
> The self-same lineaments, the same
> Marks of identity were there,
> Yet, Oh how different! One aspires to heaven,
> Pants for its sempiternal heritage,
> And ever changing, ever rising, still
> Wantons in endless being;
> The other for a time the unwilling sport
> Of circumstance and passion, struggles on,
> Fleets through its sad duration rapidly;
> Then, like a useless and worn out machine,
> Rots, perishes, and passes."

Now, when it is found that this poem, thus containing the doctrine of immortality, is presented with the distinct statement that Shelley himself in maturer life departed from its offensive dogmas—when it is accompanied by his own letter in which he expresses his wish for its suppression—when, therefore, it is not given even as containing his deliberate assertions, but only as a feature in the development of his intellectual character—surely all sting is taken out of the rash and uncertain passages which have been selected as indicating blasphemy! But is it not antidote enough to the poison of a pretended atheism, that the poet who is supposed to-day to deny Deity finds Deity in all things?

I cannot proceed with this defence without feeling that I move tremulously among sacred things which should be approached only in serene contemplation; that I am compelled to solicit your attention to considerations more fit to be weighed in the stillness of thought than amidst the excitements of a public trial; and that I am able only to suggest reasonings which, if woven into a chain, no strength of mine could utter, nor your kindest patience follow.

But the fault is not mine. I cannot otherwise even hint the truth—the living truth—of this case to your minds as it fills and struggles in my own, or protect my client and friend from a prosecution without parallel in our legal history. If the prosecutor, in return for his own conviction of publishing some cheap and popular work of alleged blasphemy —prepared, calculated, and intended by the author to shake the religious principles of the uneducated and the young— has attempted to assail the efforts of genius, and to bring into question the relations, the uses, the tendencies of the divinest faculties, I must not shrink from entreating you to consider those bearings of the question which are essential to its jus-

And if you feel unable fully to examine them within the limits of a trial, and in the atmosphere of a court of justice, yet if you feel with me that they are necessary to a just decision, you cannot doubt what your duty to the defendant and to justice is on a criminal charge!

Pardon me, therefore, if I now seek to show you, by a great example, how unjustly you would deal with so vast and so divine a thing as the imagination of a poet, if you were to take his isolated passages which may seem to deal too boldly with sacred things, and, without regard to the process of the faculty by which they are educed, to brand them as the effusions of a blasphemous mind, or as tending to evil issues. That example will also show you how a poet—devoting the noblest powers to the loftiest themes—when he ventures to grapple with the spiritual existences revealed by the Christian faith, in the very purpose of vindicating "the ways of God to men" may seem to incur a charge like the present, and with as much justice, and may be absolved from it only by nice regard to the tendencies of the divine faculty he exerts.

I speak not of a "marvellous boy," as Shelley was at eighteen, but of Milton, in the maturity of his powers, when he brought all the "spoils of time" and the clustered beauty hoarded through a long life to the deliberate construction of a work which should never die. His case is the converse of that of Shelley—he begins from an opposite point; he falls into an opposite error; but he expatiates in language and imagery out of which Mr. Hetherington might shape a charge as specious as that which he has given you to decide.

Shelley fancies himself irreligious, and everywhere falters or trembles into piety; Milton, believing himself engaged in a most pious work, is led by the tendencies of his imagination to individualize—to adorn—to enthrone—the enemy of God,

and to invest his struggles against Omnipotence with all the nobleness of a patriotic resistance to tyranny, and his suffering from Almighty justice with the graces of fortitude. Let it not be urged that the language which his Satan utters is merely to be regarded with reference to dramatic proprieties —it is attributed to the being in whom the interest of his poem centres, and on whom admiration and sympathy attend as on a sufferer in the eternal struggle of right against power. Omnipotence becomes tyranny in the poet's vision, and resistance to its requisitions appears the more generous even because hopelessly vain.

Before I advert to that language, and ask you to compare it with the expressions selected for prosecution, let me call to your recollection the grandeurs—nay, the luxuries of thought with which the "Lost Archangel" is surrounded: the magic by which even out of the materials of torture dusky magnificence is created in his place of exile, beyond "the wealth of Ormus and of Ind;" and the faded glory and unconquerable spirit attributed to those rebel legions who still sustain him in opposition to the Most High. Observe the hosts, still angelic, as they march at his bidding!—

> "Anon they move
> In perfect phalanx to the Dorian mood
> Of flutes and soft recorders; such as raised
> To height of noblest temper heroes old
> Arming to battle; and, instead of rage,
> Deliberate valor breathed, firm and unmoved
> With dread of death, to flight or foul retreat;
> Nor wanting power to mitigate and 'suage
> With solemn touches troubled thoughts, and chase
> Anguish, and doubt, and fear, and sorrow, and pain,
> From mortal or immortal minds."

Whether we listen to those who—

> "More mild,
> Retreated in a silent valley, sing,
> With notes angelical, to many a harp
> Their own heroic deeds and hapless fall
> By doom of battle"——

or those with whom the moral philosopher sympathizes yet more—who

> "Sat on a hill retired
> In thoughts more elevate, and reason'd high
> Of providence, foreknowledge, will and fate,
> Fix'd fate, free will, foreknowledge absolute"——

or expatiate over the muster-roll of their chiefs, in which all the splendors of the East, the gigantic mysteries of Egypt, and the chastest forms of Grecian beauty gleam on us—all reflect back the greatness of him who surveys them with "tears such as angels weep." His very armor and accoutrements glisten on us with a thousand beauties!

> "His ponderous shield,
> Ethereal temper, massy, large, and round,
> Behind him cast; the broad circumference
> Hung on his shoulders like the moon"——

And not only like the moon as seen to the upturned gaze of ordinary men, but as associated with Italian art and discerned from places whose names are music—

> ——"Like the moon whose orb
> Through optic glass the Tuscan artist views
> At evening, from the top of Fesolè,
> Or in Valdarno, to descry new lands,
> Rivers, or mountains in her spotty globe."

"His spear" is not only likened to a pine hewn in the depth of mountain forests, but, as if the sublimest references to nature were insufficient to accumulate glories for the bearer, is consecrated by allusions to the thousand storms and thousand thunders which the mast of an imperial ship withstands.

> "His spear (to equal which the tallest pine
> Hewn on Norwegian hills, to be the mast
> Of some great admiral, were but a wand)
> He walk'd with, to support uneasy steps
> Over the burning marle; not like those steps
> On Heaven's azure."

Now, having seen how the great Christian poet has lavished all the glories of his art on the attendant hosts and per-

sonal investiture of the brave opponent of almighty power, let us attend to the language in which he addresses his comrade in enterprise and suffering.

> "Into what pit thou seest,
> From what height fallen — so much the stronger proved
> He with his thunder: and till then who knew
> The force of those dire arms? Yet not for those,
> Nor what the potent Victor in his rage
> Can else inflict, do I repent or change,
> Though changed in outward lustre, that fix'd mind,
> And high disdain, from sense of injured merit,
> That with the Mightiest raised me to contend,
> And to the fierce contention brought along
> Innumerable force of spirits arm'd,
> That durst dislike his reign, and, me preferring,
> His utmost power with adverse power opposed
> In dubious battle on the plains of Heaven,
> And shook his throne!"

Such is the force of the poet's enthusiastic sympathy with the speaker that the reader almost thinks omnipotence doubtful; or, if that is impossible, admires the more the courage that can resist it! The chief proceeds—

> "What though the field be lost?
> All is not lost; the unconquerable will,
> And study of revenge, immortal hate,
> And courage never to submit or yield,
> And what is else not to be overcome;
> That glory never shall his wrath or might
> Extort from me. To bow and sue for grace
> With suppliant knee, and deify his power,
> Who from the terror of this arm so late
> Doubted his empire; that were low indeed,
> That were an ignominy, and shame beneath
> This downfall!"

This mighty representation of generous resistance, of mind superior to fortune, of resolution nobler than the conquest, concludes by proclaiming "eternal war" against him—

> "Who now triumphs, and in the excess of joy,
> Sole reigning, holds the tyranny of heaven."

Surely, but for the exquisite grace of the language compared with the baldness of Shelley's, I might parallel from this speech all that the indictment charges about "an

Almighty Fiend" and "Tyrannous Omnipotence." Listen again to the more composed determination and sedate self-reliance of the archangelic sufferer!

> "Is this the region? this the soil, the clime?"
> Said then the lost archangel, "this the seat
> That we must change for heaven? this mournful gloom
> For that celestial light? Be it so, since he
> Who now is sovereign can dispose and bid
> What shall be right; farthest from him is best,
> Whom reason hath equall'd, force hath made supreme
> Above his equals. Farewell, happy fields,
> Where joy forever dwells! Hail, horrors, hail!
> Infernal world, and thou, profoundest hell,
> Receive thy new possessor; one who brings
> A mind not to be changed by place or time.
> The mind is its own place, and in itself
> Can make a heaven of hell, a hell of heaven.
> What matter where, if I be still the same?
> And what I should be, all but less than he
> Whom thunder hath made greater. Here at least
> We shall be free; the Almighty hath not built
> Here for his envy, will not drive us hence;
> Here we may reign secure, and in my choice
> To reign is worth ambition, though in hell;
> Better to reign in hell than serve in heaven!"

I might multiply passages of the same kind; but I dare only allude to the proposition made of assaulting the throne of God "with Tartarean sulphur and strange fire, his own invented torments," and to the address of Satan to the newly-created sun, in which he actually curses the love of God.

Suppose that last passage introduced into this indictment —suppose that instead of the unintelligible lines beginning "They have three words, God, Hell, and Heaven," we had these: "Be then his love accursed," with the innuendo, "thereby meaning the love of Almighty God," how would you deal with the charge? How! but by looking at the object of the great poem of which those words are part; by observing how the poet, incapable of resting in a mere abstraction, had been led insensibly to clothe it from the armory of virtue and grandeur; by showing that although the names of the Almighty and Satan were retained, in truth, other ideas

had usurped those names, as the theme itself had eluded even Milton's grasp!

I will not ask you whether you agree with me in the defence which might be made for Milton; but I will ask, do you not feel with me that these are matters for another tribunal? Do you not feel with me that except that the boldness of Milton's thoughts come softened to the ears by the exquisite beauty of Milton's language, I may find parallels in the passages I have quoted from the "Paradise Lost" for those selected for prosecution from "Queen Mab?"

Do you not feel with me that, as without a knowledge of the "Paradise Lost," you could not absolve the publisher of Milton from the prosecution of "some mute, inglorious" Hetherington; so neither can you, dare you, convict Mr. Moxon of a libel on God and religion in publishing the works of Shelley without having read and studied them all?

If rashly you assail the mighty masters of thought and fantasy, you will, indeed, assail them in vain for the purpose of suppression, though not for the purpose of torture; all you can do is to make them suffer, as being human, they are liable to corporal suffering; but, like the wounded spirits of Milton, "they will soon close," "confounded, though immortal?"

If, however, these are considerations affecting the exercise of human genius on themes beyond its grasp, which we cannot discuss in this place, however essential to the decision of the charge, there is one plain position which I will venture to assert: that the poetry which pretends to a denial of God or of an immortal life must contain its own refutation in itself, and sustain what it would deny!

A poet, though never one of the highest order, may "link vice to a radiant angel;" he may diffuse luxurious indifference to virtue and to truth; but he cannot inculcate atheism. Let

him strive to do it, and like Balaam, who came to curse, like him he must end in blessing!

His art convicts him; for it is "Eternity revealing itself in Time!" His fancies may be wayward, his theories absurd, but they will prove, no less in their failure than in their success, the divinity of their origin and the inadequacy of this world to give scope to his impulses. They are the beatings of the soul against the bars of its clay tenement, which though they may ruffle and sadden it, prove that it is winged for a diviner sphere!

Young has said, "An undevout astronomer is mad;" how much more truly might he have said, an atheist poet is a contradiction in terms! Let the poet take what range of associations he will—let him adopt what notions he may—he cannot dissolve his alliance with the eternal. Let him strive to shut out the vistas of the future by encircling the present with images of exquisite beauty; his own forms of ideal grace will disappoint him with eternal looks, and vindicate the immortality they were fashioned to veil! Let him rear temples, and consecrate them to fabled divinities, they will indicate in their enduring beauty "temples not made with hands, eternal in the heavens!"

If he celebrates the delights of social intercourse, the festal reference to their fragility includes the sense of that which must endure; for the very sadness which tempers them speaks the longing after that "which prompts the eternal sigh."

If he desires to bid the hearts of thousands beat as one man at the touch of tragic passion, he must present "the future in the instant"—show in the death-grapple of contending emotions a strength which death cannot destroy—vindicate the immortality of affection at the moment when the warm passages of life are closed against it; and anticipate

in the virtue which dares to die the power by which "mortality shall be swallowed up of life!"

The world is too narrow for us. Time is too short for man, and the poet only feels the sphere more inadequate, and pants for the "all-hail hereafter" with more urgent sense of weakness than his fellows:

> "Too — too contracted are these walls of flesh,
> This vital heat too cold; these visual orbs,
> Though inconceivably endow'd, too dim
> For any passion of the soul which leads
> To ecstasy, and all the frigid bonds
> Of time and change disdaining, takes the range
> Along the line of limitless desires!"

If this prosecution can succeed, on what principle can the publishers of the great works of ancient times, replete with the images of idolatrous faith, and with moralities only to be endured as historical, escape a similar doom?

These are the works which engage and reward the first labors of our English youth; which, in spite of the objections raised to them, practically teach lessons of beauty and wisdom —the sense of antiquity—the admiration of heroic daring and suffering; and refine and elevate their lives. It was destined in the education of the human race that imperfect and faint suggestions of truth, combined with exquisite perceptions of beauty, should in a few teeming years give birth to images of grace which, untouched by time, people the retreats which are sought by youthful toil, and make learning lovely. Why shall not these be brought, with the poetry of Shelley, within the range of criminal jurisdiction?

Because, with all their beauty, they do not belong to the passions of the present time; because they hold their dominion apart from the realities which form the business of life; because they are presented to the mind as creations of another sphere, to be admired, not believed.

And yet, without prosecution—without offence—one of the greatest and purest of our English poets, wearied with the selfishness which he saw pervading a Christian nation, has dared an ejaculating wish for the return of those old palpable shapes of divinity, when he exclaimed,

> "Great God! I'd rather be
> A Pagan suckled in a creed outworn,
> So might I, standing on some pleasant lea,
> Have glimpses which may make me less forlorn,
> Have sight of Proteus coming from the sea,
> Or hear old Triton blow his wreathed horn!"

And the fantasies of "Queen Mab," if not so compact of imagination, are as harmless now as those forms of Grecian deities which Wordsworth thus invokes! Pure—passionless—they were while their author lived; they have grown classic by that touch of death which stopped the generous heart and teeming fancy of their fated author. They have no more influence on living opinion than that world of beauty to which Shelley adverts when he exclaims in "Hellas,"

> "But Greece and her foundations are
> Built below the tide of war,
> Based on the crystalline sea
> Of thought and its eternity."

Having considered this charge chiefly as affecting poetry, I must not forget that the last passage selected by the prosecutor is in prose, culled from the essay which was appended to the poem of "Queen Mab," disclaimed by the editor—disclaimed by Shelley long before he reached the prime of manhood—but rightly preserved, shocking as it is in itself, as essential to the just contemplation of his moral and intellectual nature.

They form the dark ground of a picture of surpassing interest to the philosopher. There shall you see a poet whose fancies are most ethereal, struggling with a theory gross, material, shallow, imaging the great struggle by which the

spirit of the eternal seeks to subdue the material world to its uses.

His genius was pent up within the hard and bitter rind of his philosophy, as Ariel was in the rift of the cloven pine; and what wonder if a spirit thus enthralled should send forth strange and discordant cries? Because the words which those strange voices syllabled are recorded here, will you say the record is a crime?

I recollect in the speech of that great ornament of our profession, Mr. Erskine, an illustration of the injustice of selecting part of a conversation or of a book, and because singly considered it is shocking, charging a criminal intent on the utterer or the publisher; which, if, at first, it may not seem applicable to this case, will be found essentially to govern it. He refers to the passage in the Bible, "The fool hath said in his heart, there is no God," and shows how the publisher of the Book of God itself might be charged with atheism by the insertion only of the latter division of the sentence.

It is not surely by the division of a sentence only that the context may be judged, but by the general intent of him who publishes what is in itself offensive, for the purpose of curious record—of controversy—of evidence—of example. The publisher of Shelley has not indeed said "The fool hath said in his heart, there is no God;" but he has in effect said, The poet has tried to say with his lips "There is no God," but his genius and his heart belie his words!

What indeed does the publisher of Shelley's works virtually say, where he thus presents to his readers this record of the poet's life and death? He says—Behold! Here is a spectacle which angels may admire and weep over! Here is a poet of fancy the most ethereal—feelings the most devout—

charity the most Christian—enthralled by opinions the most cold, hollow, and debasing!

Here is a youth endowed with that sensibility to the beautiful and the grand which peoples his minutes with the perceptions of years—who, with a spirit of self-sacrifice which the eldest Christianity might exult in if found in one of its martyrs, is ready to lay down that intellectual being—to be lost in loss itself—if by annihilation he could multiply the enjoyments and hasten the progress of his species—and yet, with strange wilfulness, rejecting that religion in form to which in essence he is imperishably allied!

Observe these radiant fancies—pure and cold as frostwork—how would they be kindled by the warmth of Christian love! Track those "thoughts that wander through eternity," and think how they would repose in their proper home! And trace the inspired, yet erring, youth, poem after poem—year after year, month after month—how shall you see the icy fetters which encircle his genius gradually dissolve; the wreaths of mist ascend from his path, and the distance spread out before him peopled with human affections and skirted by angel wings! See how this seeming atheist begins to adore—how the divine image of suffering and love presented at Calvary, never unfelt, begins to be seen, and in its contemplation the softened, not yet convinced, poet exclaims, in his "Prometheus," of the followers of Christ—

> "The wise, the pure, the lofty, and the just,
> Whom thy slaves hate—for being like to thee!"

And thus he proceeds—with light shining more and more toward the perfect day, which he was not permitted to realize in this world. As you trace this progress, alas! death veils it—veils it, not stops it—and this perturbed, imperfect, but

glorious being is hidden from us—"Till the sea shall give up its dead!"

What say you now to the book which exhibits this spectacle and stops with this catastrophe? Is it a libel on religion and God? Talk of proofs of divine existence in the wonders of the material universe, there is nothing in any—nor in all—compared to the proof which this indicted volume conveys.

What can the telescope disclose of worlds and suns and systems in the heavens above us, or the microscope detect in the descending scale of various life, endowed with a speech and a language like that with which Shelley, being dead, here speaks? Not even do the most serene productions of poets, whose faculties in this world have attained comparative harmony—strongly as they plead for the immortality of the mind which produced them—afford so unanswerable a proof of a life to come as the mighty embryo which this book exhibits, as the course the frailty, the imperfection, with the dark curtain dropped on all!

It is, indeed, when best surveyed, but the infancy of an eternal being, an infancy wayward but gigantic, an infancy which we shall never fully understand till we behold its development "when time shall be no more"—when doubt shall be dissolved in vision—"when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and when this mortal shall have put on immortality!"

Let me, before I sit down, entreat you to ask yourselves where the course of prosecution will stop if you crown with success Mr. Hetherington's revenge. Revenge, did I say? I recall the word. Revenge means the returning of injury for injury—an emotion most unwise and unchristian, but still human—the satisfaction of a feeling of ill-regulated justice cherished by a heart which judges bitterly in its own cause.

But this attempt to retaliate on one who is a stranger to the evil suffered—this infliction of misery for doing that which the prosecutor has maintained within these works the right of all men to do—has no claim to the savage plea of wild justice; but is poor, cruel, paltry injustice; as bare of excuse as ever tyrant, above or below the opinion of the wise and good, ever ventured to threaten.

Admit its power in this case—grant its right to select for the punishment of blasphemy the exhibition of an anomaly as harmless as the stuffed aspic in a museum, or as its image on the passionless bosom of a pictured Cleopatra—and what ancient, what modern history, shall be lent unchallenged to our friends?

If the thousand booksellers who sell the "Paradise Lost" —from the greatest publisher in London or Edinburgh down to the proprietor of the little book-stall where the poor wayfarer snatches a hasty glance at the grandeur and beauty of the poet and goes on his way refreshed—may hope that genius will render to the name of Milton what they deny to that of Shelley, what can they who sell "The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire" hope from the prosecutor of "Queen Mab?"

In that work are two celebrated chapters, sparkling with all the meretricious felicities of epigrammatic style, which, full of polished sarcasm against infant Christianity, are elaborately directed to wither the fame of its martyrs and confessors with bitterest scorn—two chapters which, if published at a penny each, would do more mischief than thousands of metaphysical poems; but which, retained in their appropriate place, to be sought only by the readers of history, may serve the cause of truth by proving the poverty of the spite by which it has been assailed, and find ample counterpoise in the sequel. The

possibility that this history should be suppressed by some descendant of Gibbon, who might extravagantly suppose it his duty to stifle cold and crafty sneers aimed at the first followers of Christ, was urged—and urged with success—against me when I pleaded for the right of those descendants to the fruits of the labors of their ancestor; yet, if you sanction this attempt, any Hetherington may compel by law that suppression, the remote possibility of which has been accepted as a reason for denying to the posterity of the author a property in the work he has created!

This work, invested with the peculiar interest which belongs to the picture of waning greatness, has recently been printed in a cheap form, under the sanction of a dignitary of the established church—a Christian poet of the noblest aim—whose early genius was the pride of our fairest university, and who is now the honored minister of the very parish in which we are assembled.

If I were now defending Mr. Milman, of whose friendship I am justly proud, for this last and cheapest and best edition of Gibbon, I could only resort to the arguments I am now urging for Mr. Moxon, and claim the benefit of the same distinction between the tendency of a book adapted to the promotion of infidelity and one which, containing incidental matter of offence, is commended to the student with those silent guards which its form and accompaniments supply.

True it is that Mr. Milman has accompanied the text with notes in which he sometimes explains or counteracts the insinuations of the author; but what notes can be so effectual as that which follows "Queen Mab"—in which Shelley's own letter is set forth, stating, on his authority, that the work was immature and that he did not intend it for the general eye? Is not the publication of this letter by the publisher

as decisive of his motive—not to commend the wild fancies and stormy words of the young poet to the reader's approval, but to give them as part of his biography—as the notes of Mr. Milman are of that which no one doubts, his desire to make the perusal of Gibbon healthful?

Prosper this attempt, and what a field of speculative prosecution will open before us! Every publisher of the works of Rousseau, of Voltaire, of Volney, of Hume—of the classics and of their translations—works regarded as innoxious, because presented in a certain aspect and offered to a certain class, will become liable to every publisher of penny blasphemy who may suffer or hate or fear the law; nor of such only, but of every small attorney in search of practice, who may find in the machinery of the crown-office the facilities of extortion.

Nor will the unjust principle you are asked to sanction stop with retaliation in the case of alleged blasphemy—the retailer of cheap lasciviousness, if checked in his wicked trade, will have his revenge against the works of the mighty dead in which some tinge of mortal stain may unfortunately be detected. The printer of one of those penny atrocities which are thrust into the hands of ingenuous youths when bound on duty or innocent pleasure, the emissaries of which—children often themselves—mount the chariot and board the steamboat to scatter that poison which may infect the soul as long as the soul shall endure—whom, to do this prosecutor justice, I know he disclaims—may obtain true bills of indictment against any man who has sold Horace, or Virgil, or Lucretius, or Ovid, or Juvenal—against all who have sold a copy of any of our old dramatists—and thus not only Congreve, and Farquhar, and Wycherley, but Fletcher, and Massinger, and Ford, and Webster, and Ben Jonson; nay, with reverence be it spoken, even

Shakespeare, though ever pure in essence, may be placed at the mercy of an insect abuser of the press—unless juries have the courage and the virtue to recognize the distinction between a man who publishes works which are infidel or impure, because they are infidel or impure, and publishes them in a form and at a price which indicate the desire that they should work out mischief, and one who publishes works in which evil of the same kind may be found, but who publishes them because, in spite of that imperfection, they are on the whole for the edification and delight of mankind—between one who tenders the mischief for approbation and one who exposes it for example.

And are you prepared to succumb to this new censorship? Will you allow Mr. Hetherington to prescribe what leaves you shall tear from the classic volumes in your libraries? Shall he dictate to you how much of Lord Byron—a writer far more influential than Shelley—you shall be allowed to lend to your friends without fear of his censure? Shall he drag into court the vast productions of the German mind, and ask juries to decide whether the translator of Goethe, Schiller, Wieland, and Lessing—dealing with sacred things with a boldness to which we are unused—are guilty of crime? Shall he call for judgment on that stupendous work, the "Faust," with its prologue in heaven, which has been presented by my friend Mr. Hayward, whose able assistance I have to-day, with happy vividness to English readers—and ask a jury to take it in their hand, and at an hour's glance to decide whether it is a libel on God, or a hymn by genius to his praise?

Do you not feel those matters are for other seasons—for another sphere? If so, will you, in the dark—without knowledge—without evidence—sanction a prosecution which will, in its result, impose new and strange tasks on juries who may

decide on other trials; which may destroy the just allowance accorded to learning even under absolute monarchies; and place every man who hereafter shall print, or sell, or give, or lend, any one of a thousand volumes sanctioned by ages, at the mercy of any prosecutor who for malice, for gain, or mere mischief, may choose to denounce him as a blasphemer?

And now I commend into your hands the cause of the defendant—the cause of genius—the cause of learning—the cause of history—the cause of thought. I have not sought to maintain it by assailing the law as it has been expounded by courts and administered by juries; which, if altered, should be changed by the authority of the legislature, and neither by the violation of oaths nor by the machinery which the prosecutor has employed to render it odious at the cost of those whom he himself contends to be guiltless; but I have striven to convince you that by a just application of that law you may hold this publication of the works of Shelley to be no crime.

It has been fairly conceded that Mr. Moxon is a most respectable publisher; one who has done good service to the cause of poetry and wisdom; and one who could not intentionally publish a blasphemous work without treason to all the associations which honor his life. Beginning his career under the auspices of Rogers, the eldest of a great age of poets, and blessed with the continued support of that excellent person, who never broke by one unworthy line the charm of moral grace which pervades his works, he has been associated with Lamb, whose kindness embraced all sects, all parties, all classes, and whose genius shed new and pleasant lights on daily life; with Southey, the pure and childlike in heart; with Coleridge, in the light of whose Christian philosophy these indicted poems would assume their true character as mournful, yet salutary specimens of power developed imperfectly in this world;

and with Wordsworth, whose works so long neglected or scorned, but so long silently nurturing tastes for the lofty and the pure, it has been Mr. Moxon's privilege to diffuse largely throughout this and other lands, and with them the sympathies which link the human heart to nature and to God, and all classes of mankind to each other!

Reject, then, in your justice, the charge which imputes to such a man that by publishing this book he has been guilty of blasphemy against the God whom he reveres! Refuse to set the fatal precedent, which will not only draw the fame of the illustrious dead into question before juries, without time to investigate their merits; which may not only harass the first publishers of these works; but which will beset the course of every bookseller, every librarian, throughout the country, with perpetual snares and make our criminal courts the arenas for a savage warfare of literary prosecutions!

Protect our noble literature from the alternative of being either corrupted or enslaved! Terminate those anxieties which this charge, so unprovoked—so undeserved—has now for months inflicted on the defendant and his friends by that verdict of "Not guilty," which will disappoint only those who desire that cheap blasphemy should have free course; which the noblest, and purest, and most pious of your own generation will rejoice in; and for which their posterity will honor and bless you!

ARNOLD

THOMAS ARNOLD, an eminent English educator, was born at West Cowes, on the Isle of Wight, June 13, 1795. He was educated at Corpus Christi College, Oxford, and gained a fellowship at Oriel College in 1815, which he retained until shortly before his marriage in 1820, when he removed to Laleham. Here for eight years he had the care of pupils whom he prepared for the universities. He had taken deacon's orders in the Church of England in 1818, and soon after his election to the headmastership of Rugby, 1827, was advanced to the priesthood. The remainder of his life was passed at Rugby, where his death occurred June 12, 1842. In this position he accomplished a great work in elevating the standard of English public school education, his primary aim in teaching being to arouse the pupils to think for themselves. More deeply than any instructor of his time Arnold impressed himself upon his pupils, not alone by his influence in the schoolroom, but also by his weekly sermons in the college chapel, where his power as a moral and religious teacher was more immediately felt. All readers of "Tom Brown's School Days" delight in the true picture there given of this ideal teacher's relation to his scholars. His political principles were those of the Liberals, and as a theologian he was the leader of the Broad Church thinkers of his day. As such he was subjected to the fiercest criticism from his theological opponents. His principal works include a valuable edition of Thucydides, 1835; "History of Rome," 1842; "Letters on Modern History," 1842; six volumes of "Sermons," 1876.

SERMON: ALIVE IN GOD

"God is not the God of the dead, but of the living."—Matt. xxii, 32.

WE hear these words as a part of our Lord's answer to the Sadducees; and as their question was put in evident profaneness, and the answer to it is one which to our minds is quite obvious and natural, so we are apt to think that in this particular story there is less than usual that particularly concerns us. But it so happens that our Lord in answering the Sadducees has brought in one of the most universal and most solemn of all truths,—which is indeed implied in many parts of the Old Testament, but which the Gospel has revealed to us in all its fulness,—the truth

contained in the words of the text, that "God is not the God of the dead, but of the living."

I would wish to unfold a little what is contained in these words which we often hear even, perhaps, without quite understanding them, and many times oftener without fully entering into them. And we may take them, first, in their first part, where they say that "God is not the God of the dead."

The word "dead," we know, is constantly used in Scripture in a double sense, as meaning those who are dead spiritually as well as those who are dead naturally. And in either sense the words are alike applicable: "God is not the God of the dead."

God's not being the God of the dead signifies two things: that they who are without him are dead, as well as that they who are dead are also without him. So far as our knowledge goes respecting inferior animals they appear to be examples of this truth. They appear to us to have no knowledge of God; and we are not told that they have any other life than the short one of which our senses inform us. I am well aware that our ignorance of their condition is so great that we may not dare to say anything of them positively; there may be a hundred things true respecting them which we neither know nor imagine. I would only say that according to that most imperfect light in which we see them the two points of which I have been speaking appear to meet in them: we believe that they have no consciousness of God, and we believe that they will die. And so far, therefore, they afford an example of the agreement, if I may so speak, between these two points; and were intended, perhaps, to be to our view a continual image of it. But we had far be ter speak of ourselves. And here, too, it is the case that "God is not the

God of the dead." If we are without him we are dead, and if we are dead we are without him; in other words, the two ideas of death and absence from God are in fact synonymous.

Thus, in the account given of the fall of man, the sentence of death and of being cast out of Eden go together; and if any one compares the description of the second Eden in the Revelation, and recollects how especially it is there said that God dwells in the midst of it, and is its light by day and night, he will see that the banishment from the first Eden means a banishment from the presence of God. And thus, in the day that Adam sinned he died; for he was cast out of Eden immediately, however long he may have moved about afterward upon the earth where God was not. And how very strong to the same point are the words of Hezekiah's prayer, "The grave cannot praise thee, Death cannot celebrate thee; they that go down into the pit cannot hope for thy truth;" words which express completely the feeling that God is not the God of the dead. This, too, appears to be the sense generally of the expression used in various parts of the Old Testament, "Thou shalt surely die."

It is, no doubt, left purposely obscure; nor are we ever told in so many words all that is meant by death; but, surely, it always implies a separation from God, and the being—whatever the notion may extend to—the being dead to him.

Thus, when David had committed his great sin and had expressed his repentance for it, Nathan tells him, "The Lord also hath put away thy sin; thou shalt not die:" which means, most expressively, thou shalt not die to God.

In one sense David died, as all men die; nor was he by any means freed from the punishment of his sin; he was not, in that sense, forgiven, but he was allowed still to regard God as his God; and therefore his punishments were but

fatherly chastisements from God's hand, designed for his profit that he might be partaker of God's holiness.

And thus although Saul was sentenced to lose his kingdom, and although he was killed with his sons on Mount Gilboa, yet I do not think that we find the sentence passed upon him, "Thou shalt surely die;" and therefore we have no right to say that God had ceased to be his God although he visited him with severe chastisements and would not allow him to hand down to his sons the crown of Israel. Observe, also, the language of the eighteenth chapter of Ezekiel, where the expressions occur so often, "He shall surely live," and "He shall surely die."

We have no right to refer these to a mere extension on the one hand, or a cutting short on the other, of the term of earthly existence. The promise of living long in the land, or, as in Hezekiah's case, of adding to his days fifteen years, is very different from the full and unreserved blessing, "Thou shalt surely live." And we know, undoubtedly, that both the good and the bad to whom Ezekiel spoke died alike the natural death of the body. But the peculiar force of the promise and of the threat was, in the one case, Thou shalt belong to God; in the other, Thou shalt cease to belong to him; although the veil was not yet drawn up which concealed the full import of those terms, "belonging to God," and "ceasing to belong to him:" nay, can we venture to affirm that it is fully drawn aside even now?

I have dwelt on this at some length, because it really seems to place the common state of the minds of too many amongst us in a light which is exceedingly awful; for if it be true, as I think the Scripture implies, that to be dead and to be without God are precisely the same thing, then can it be denied that the symptoms of death are strongly marked upon many

of us? Are there not many who never think of God or care about his service? Are there not many who live, to all appearance, as unconscious of his existence as we fancy the inferior animals to be?

And is it not quite clear that to such persons God cannot be said to be their God? He may be the God of heaven and earth, the God of the universe, the God of Christ's church; but he is not their God, for they feel to have nothing at all to do with him; and therefore, as he is not their God, they are, and must be according to the Scripture, reckoned among the dead.

But God is the God "of the living." That is, as before, all who are alive live unto him; all who live unto him are alive. "God said, I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob;" and therefore, says our Lord, "Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob are not and cannot be dead." They cannot be dead, because God owns them: he is not ashamed to be called their God; therefore they are not cast out from him; therefore, by necessity, they live.

Wonderful, indeed, is the truth here implied, in exact agreement, as we have seen, with the general language of Scripture; that, as she who but touched the hem of Christ's garment was in a moment relieved from her infirmity, so great was the virtue which went out from him; so they who are not cast out from God, but have anything whatever to do with him, feel the virtue of his gracious presence penetrating their whole nature; because he lives, they must live also.

Behold, then, life and death set before us; not remote (if a few years be, indeed, to be called remote), but even now present before us; even now suffered or enjoyed. Even now, we are alive unto God, or dead unto God; and, as we are either the one or the other, so we are, in the highest possible

sense of the terms, alive or dead. In the highest possible sense of the terms; but who can tell what that highest possible sense of the terms is? So much has, indeed, been revealed to us, that we know now that death means a conscious and perpetual death, as life means a conscious and perpetual life.

But greatly, indeed, do we deceive ourselves, if we fancy that, by having thus much told us, we have also risen to the infinite heights, or descended to the infinite depths, contained in those little words, life and death. They are far higher, and far deeper, than ever thought or fancy of man has reached to. But, even on the first edge of either, at the visible beginnings of that infinite ascent or descent, there is surely something which may give us a foretaste of what is beyond. Even to us in this mortal state, even to you advanced but so short a way on your very earthly journey, life and death have a meaning: to be dead unto God, or to be alive to him, are things perceptibly different.

For, let me ask of those who think least of God, who are most separate from him, and most without him, whether there is not now actually, perceptibly, in their state, something of the coldness, the loneliness, the fearfulness of death? I do not ask them whether they are made unhappy by the fear of God's anger; of course they are not: for they who fear God are not dead to him, nor he to them.

The thought of him gives them no disquiet at all; this is the very point we start from. But I would ask them whether they know what it is to feel God's blessing. For instance: we all of us have our troubles of some sort or other, our disappointments, if not our sorrows. In these troubles, in these disappointments,—I care not how small they may be,—have they known what it is to feel that God's hand is over

them; that these little annoyances are but his fatherly correction; that he is all the time loving us, and supporting us? In seasons of joy, such as they taste very often, have they known what it is to feel that they are tasting the kindness of their heavenly Father, that their good things come from his hand and are but an infinitely slight foretaste of his love? Sickness, danger; I know that they come to many of us but rarely; but if we have known them, or at least sickness, even in its lighter form, if not in its graver,—have we felt what it is to know that we are in our Father's hands, that he is with us, and will be with us to the end; that nothing can hurt those whom he loves?

Surely, then, if we have never tasted anything of this: if in trouble, or in joy, or in sickness, we are left wholly to ourselves to bear as we can and enjoy as we can; if there is no voice that ever speaks out of the heights and the depths around us to give any answer to our own; if we are thus left to ourselves in this vast world,—there is in this a coldness and a loneliness; and whenever we come to be, of necessity, driven to be with our own hearts alone, the coldness and the loneliness must be felt. But consider that the things which we see around us cannot remain with us nor we with them. The coldness and loneliness of the world, without God, must be felt more and more as life wears on; in every change of our own state, in every separation from or loss of a friend, in every more sensible weakness of our own bodies, in every additional experience of the uncertainty of our own counsels, —the deathlike feeling will come upon us more and more strongly: we shall gain more of that fearful knowledge which tells us that "God is not the God of the dead."

And so, also, the blessed knowledge that he is the God "of the living" grows upon those who are truly alive. Surely he "is not far from every one of us." No occasion of life

fails to remind those who live unto him that he is their God and that they are his children. On light occasions or on grave ones, in sorrow and in joy, still the warmth of his love is spread, as it were, all through the atmosphere of their lives; they forever feel his blessing. And if it fills them with joy unspeakable even now, when they so often feel how little they deserve it; if they delight still in being with God, and in living to him, let them be sure that they have in themselves the unerring witness of life eternal: God is the God of the living, and all who are with him must live.

Hard it is, I well know, to bring this home in any degree to the minds of those who are dead; for it is of the very nature of the dead that they can hear no words of life. But it has happened that, even whilst writing what I have just been uttering to you, the news reached me that one who two months ago was one of your number, who this very half-year has shared in all the business and amusements of this place, is passed already into that state where the meanings of the terms life and death are become fully revealed. He knows what it is to live unto God and what it is to die to him. Those things which are to us unfathomable mysteries are to him all plain: and yet but two months ago he might have thought himself as far from attaining this knowledge as any of us can do. Wherefore it is clear that these things, life and death, may hurry their lesson upon us sooner than we deem of, sooner than we are prepared to receive it. And that were indeed awful, if, being dead to God, and yet little feeling it because of the enjoyments of our worldly life, those enjoyments were on a sudden to be struck away from us, and we should find then that to be dead to God was death indeed, a death from which there is no waking, and in which there is no sleeping forever.

PN
6121
M3
V.12

THE LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
Santa Barbara

THIS BOOK IS DUE ON THE LAST DATE
STAMPED BELOW.

50m-9,'66(G6338s8)9482

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY
AA 000 319 857 9